






LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.


BX7321
Chap. Copyright No. R3
Shelf 1774

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.










THE
CAMPBELLITE
CHURCH

By C. N. RAY



THE CAMPBELLITE CHURCH

By
ELD. C. N. RAY,
Kirksville, Mo.

17
1734



ST. LOUIS, MO.:
NATIONAL BAPTIST PUBLISHING CO.,
1889.

BX7321
R3

Copyright, 1889.
By C. N. RAY.



PREFACE.

To have held to error in this world can be of no benefit in the world to come. But on the other hand, errors in religious belief here must, of necessity, militate to our disadvantage there. The man who sows tares in his neighbor's field is responsible for the harvest of evil, whether he does it conscientiously or not. If a man conscientiously believes an error, he will earnestly teach it; and earnest teaching will always find a following. Erroneous teaching is no exception; but naturally it has the advantage of truth. It is the seed falling into a congenial soil, attended with circumstances favorable to growth. Our Savior uttered this truth, when He said: "Men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil."

Error in doctrine is most ruinous in its consequences, as well as sinful in itself. Souls will receive and be eternally wrecked by it. Therefore, the great apostle has said: "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel

unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed," Gal. 1:8. And we read of "the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are." Rev. 20:10. Even the converted man, who teaches erroneously concerning the least commandment, will suffer loss; for Christ has said, "Whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven," Matt. 5:19.


We doubt not that there are some Christians in the so-called Christian Church. Of these we ask a hearing. There is not much hope of the blind partisan. It is almost impossible to convince him, for the reason that he loves darkness rather than light. But may we not hope that the Christian will be open to the reception of truth? Certainly he should be, even if it should cost him great sacrifices, and the overturning of his most cherished opinions. It certainly becomes each one of us to search the Scriptures carefully and prayerfully, with the determination to discard from our religious belief every thing which is not in accordance with the Word of God.

We propose, in the following pages, to state

some of the distinguishing doctrines and practices of the so-called Christian Church, and to examine them in the light of the Word of God. And in doing so, we hope, in a measure, to epitomize the Baptist side of the Campbellite controversy, and to make a book at a price which shall enable our brethren to use it as a missionary document in communities that are afflicted with Campbellism.

We trust that we write, not for the sake of controversy, but for the glory of our Divine Savior, and the promotion of His truth. Praying the blessing of God upon this work, we send it forth in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

C. N. R.



INTRODUCTION.

A new denomination of professed Christians has arisen in this nineteenth century, chiefly under the ministry of Alexander Campbell, of Bethany, Va. These people are not agreed among themselves as to what denominational name they should wear. Some of them claim that they should be called the "Church of God." Others of them think that they ought to be called the "Disciples of Christ." And others would be called "Reformers." And still others would like to be called the Christians, and to have their denomination known as the "Christian" Church. And others still, there are, who think the foregoing names too assuming. And these would be willing to be known as "Campbellites." And still others, yet, are puzzled to know what name should be used to distinguish them, as a people.

Notwithstanding all this diversity of opinion among themselves concerning the name by which they should be called, many of these people are ready to take it as an insult if any one, outside of

their number, should use the name of Mr. Campbell, their father and founder, as distinguishing them. It has been the custom for ages past to call the followers of any great leader by his name. And this, too, without the least intention of disrespect to them. As for example, the Paulicians were so called from Paulus, of the seventeenth century ; and the Petrobrusians, from Peter de Bruys, of the twelfth century. And we have, to-day, the Lutherans, Calvinists and Weslyans, from Luther, Calvin and Wesley. In fact, our modern literature abounds with such names as Millerites, Stoneites, Parkerites, etc. And why should not the followers of Alexander Campbell be called Campbellites?

There can be no good reason for this repugnance upon the part of these people, to the name Campbellite; and yet there is, doubtless, a reason. It carries a deception in the interest of Campbellism. For if, by pouting and playing the role of insulted innocence at the mention of the word Campbellite, they can induce the masses to refrain from calling them Campbellites, and to call them the Christian Church, they will both hide from view their recent human origin, and claim history WHICH IS NOT THEIR OWN.

The word Christian is found in the New Testament. We read of Christians, and the Christian Church, and the Christian martyrs, on the page of history. Now, if these so-called Christians can, by pretending to be indignant at the word Campbellite, scare and brow-beat the people into calling them the Christians, and their society the Christian church, then they will claim the New Testament Christians, and what is called the Christian Church on the page of history, and all the Christian martyrs of the ages past, as belonging to their denomination.

It would appear incredible that so daring a fraud should be attempted in the midst of the light and the moral progress of this age. We would not believe it, but for the fact that they are boldly teaching and preaching this pretension in the sight of our eyes and in the hearing of our ears. Baptists have taught, from time immemorial, that their churches have existed from the time of the apostles. And they have proven it by many of the most renowned scholars and historians that the world has ever produced. And most of these witnesses, too, were not Baptists. But not one such scholar or historian has ever testified that these so-called Christians have ex-

isted from the time of the apostles; yes, dear reader, not one world-renowned scholar or historian, inside or outside, of the ranks of Campbellism has testified to the apostolic origin and continued existence of this co-called Christian Church.

When Moses and Aaron cast down their rod before Pharoah and it became a serpent, the Egyptian pretenders did likewise. So when some Baptist preachers prepared historical charts, showing the rise of the several denominations, and representing an apostolic origin for Baptists, some of these Campbellite fellows thought that they must have somewhat also to offer. So they made for themselves charts. In these charts they represent that they began to exist on the day of Pentecost. And they possess sufficient hardihood to hang these charts on walls and point to them, representing their existence from the apostolic age. This performance has been several times done in the town of Kirksville, Mo., we learn.

It is likely that this charting business may become quite popular with these people. So look out for the charts, when the Campbells are coming! But how can intelligent men thus represent, concerning these people, who expect to stand before God in the great judgment day? This is a mystery.

THE CAMPBELLITE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE TERM CAMPBELLITE.

Some Campbellites have a great aversion to the name. They are full of resentment at the mention of the word. We cite the following as examples. In a newspaper controversy between Simpson Ely, pastor of the Campbellite congregation in Kirkville, Mo., and the author, Mr. Ely used the following language: "He (Ray) twice used the offensive term 'Campbellite' and once 'Followers of Campbell.' * * * He lacks the A, B, C of common courtesy and good manners, or he would not persist in using those terms. Mr. Ray talks of regeneration. He certainly knows nothing of it experimentally, for a regenerated man will not find such keen delight in misrepresenting his fellow men and calling them by offensive names."

We had said that the Campbellites teach the

Popish doctrine of baptismal salvation. This was the brunt of our offending.

The illustrious J. B. Jeter, of Richmond, Va., did not escape this abuse. He wrote "Campbellism Examined," and "Campbellism Re-examined." And Mr. M. E. Lard wrote a "Review of Campbellism Examined." After saying "Mr. Jeter hates Mr. Campbell with an intense hatred" he charges Mr. Jeter with misrepresentation, and says, "He could not even select a title for his book without furnishing a verification of what has just been alledged. 'Campbellism' was the only term which could vent the feelings of his heart. And yet he knew no term to be more offensive to us as a people. And he should have known that it is an act of high discourtesy to attempt to designate the views of any body of believers by terms which they hold to be unjust, and which they have repeatedly avowed do not express them. And no man, we must add, but a boor in feelings, whatever may be his factitious position in society, will stoop to the deed."

Mr. Lard then attributes the use of the term Campbellite to Mr. Jeter's scanty vocabulary, and says, "He is hence driven to the use of a term familiar to none but the charlatan, save Mr.

Jeter." See Review Camp. Ex., pp. 14, 15, 16.

A. P. Williams, of Missouri, a man of the highest 'standing, wrote "Campbell Exposed," and M. E. Lard wrote to a periodical: "Allow me to warn all our brethren who love the truth against either buying or reading a certain cold, mean book, purported to have been written by one, A. P. Williams, of Missouri. It is a sin to encourage the book, and no credit to any one to notice the man." Ray-Lucas Debate, p. 225. No one who has written or spoken against Campbellism has escaped this sort of persecution. But this is but proof of the untenableness of their position.

Do common courtesy and good manners require that we should refrain from calling the disciples of Mr. Campbell Campbellites? If so, then the most renowned scholars and leaders of thought are wanting in common courtesy and good manners.

Webster, the great standard American Lexicographer, in his Unabridged Dictionary, says: "Campbellite, from Alexander Campbell, of Virginia."

The People's Cyclopedia, Appendix, says: "Campbell, Alexander, founder of 'Campbellites.'"

In "A Dictionary of Religious Denominations, in Hitchcock's Analysis of the Bible, we read, "Disciples of Christ.—Commonly called Campbellites, from Alexander Campbell."

"Disciples of Christ, or Campbellites." Bible Companion, by J. A. Allen.

"The Disciples of Christ, or the Campbellites, as they are properly called." Schaff-Herzog Ency., p. 377.

"Disciples of Christ. Such is the title given by themselves to the denomination of which we have now to speak. They have often, even among themselves, been spoken of as Reformers, and by not a few persons have been called Campbellites." Relig. Denom., by Jos. Belcher, p. 801.

"Disciples of Christ (sometimes called Campbellites, or Reformers). As is usual in similar cases, the brethren who unite under the name of Disciples of Christ, or Christians, are nicknamed after those who have been prominent in gathering them together; they chose, however, to be recognized by the above simple and unassuming name." A. Campbell, in Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. Listen, dear reader! This last quotation is from the founder of Campbellism. And he admits that it is usual for a people to be "nick-

named after those who have been prominent in gathering them.” And, of course, as he was the man most prominent in gathering these so-called Christians, according to the usual custom, he would expect them to be called Campbellites. Mr. Campbell would have no scruples about calling the followers of Luther and Calvin Lutherans and Calvinites.

T. P. Haley, at the time pastor of the 1st Campbellite Church of St. Louis said, in a series of lectures, “My theme is Campbellism. I make no apology for the use of this term, which may possibly be offensive to some of my hearers, but I present the following explanations. It is regarded as altogether proper to denominate the views, teachings or system of theology promulgated and defended by John Calvin, of Geneva, as Calvinism. * * * Such was his prominence in developing and giving shape to them as a body of divinity, that it is eminently proper to style them Calvinism. It is not offensive to call that system of theology, which antagonizes Calvinism at each of the five points, Arminianism, because James Arminius was most prominent in its promulgation and development. Lutheranism and Methodism are terms by which we designate the

peculiar views respectively of Martin Luther and John Wesley, and the large and respectable bodies that have adopted their views as respectively denominated Lutherans and Methodists. The term Campbellism in this lecture is therefore used to indicate the 'views,' 'the teachings' or the 'system of doctrine' or body of divinity first promulgated and defended in the United States by the Campbells, Thomas and Alexander, father and son. * * * No name has been more widely known in the country, in religious circles, both in Europe and America, than that of Campbell, and no religious movement, since that of John Wesley, has produced such a profound impression upon the public as that which these gentlemen inaugurated, and which is commonly known as Campbellism." *Globe-Democrat*, 1877, quoted in *Gospel in Water*, pp. 68, 69.

"These religious people, sometimes called 'Campbellites,' or 'Campbellite Baptists,' " Frederick D. Power, pastor of the Campbellite church in Washington City at the time of President Garfield's death. *Gospel in Water*, p. 72.

The above authorities for the word Campbellite will suffice. We have not space for the great multitude of testimonies of noted authors,

lexicographers, historians and encyclopedists, who use the word Campbellite, and apply it to the so-called Christian Church. And remember, a respectable number of Campbellites themselves so use and apply the term.

CHAPTER II.

THE NAME.

The so-called Christian Church builds much on the name. It occupies a prominent place, both in the pulpit and in the press, of the special pleaders of this denomination. Their preachers teach their people that it is an insult to call them Campbellites. So, they are ready to take offense at the mention of the name. And to avoid their indignation, full many a timid soul will pronounce the words "The Christian Church" for them, though their consciences rebuke them for so doing. A Baptist stated to the author that he called the Campbellite Church "The Christian Church," though it almost choked him to pronounce the words. We should never violate conscience to please men. We are taught "To have always a conscience void of offense," Acts 24:16. And, surely, no one who regards the Campbellites as a counterfeit church can, with a clear conscience, call them the Christian Church.

After the maneuver has worked well and the

show of indignation has resulted in their being called the Christian Church by others, the Campbellite preachers turn around and say, we are the Christian Church, but you are Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, etc. They understand that when they have induced you to call them the Christian Church, that it is the same as calling them the Church of Christ. So that you have, out of your own mouth, in their opinions, unchurched yourself, and pronounced them THE CHURCH OF CHRIST! And by this sort of stratagem they, doubtless, win many to their communion.

Campbellite preachers usually put the argument on the name as follows: They very truly say that the New Testament Church is the bride of Christ. That she is called the bride, the Lamb's wife. They then say that a woman ought to wear her husband's name. And to the author they have repeatedly made an *ad hominem* argument, by saying how would you like, when you go home, to find your wife wearing some other man's name? And when we replied that we would not like it so well, they seemed for one brief moment to think they had gained a great victory. But the steel point of one truth will always dispel this

bubble. And that is, in Bible language, there is not the slightest foundation for the modern custom which requires that a man's wife shall wear her husband's name. In all the Bible there is not one instance in which a wife wore her husband's name. It was Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Rebecca, Jacob and Rachael, Joseph and Mary, Aquilla and Priscilla and so on, to the end of Revelation.

But if it were true that the Church of Christ were required to wear His name, then it would be neither Mrs. Christ, or Christian. For Christ is a name of office. And it is not customary for the wife of an officer to call herself by the name of her husband's office. It would not look well, for the wife of the president of the United States to call herself Mrs. President. And it would be equally uncomly for the wife of any other officer to discard the name of her husband and clamor to be known by his name of office. JESUS is the personal name of our Savior. We read in Luke 1:31, that the angel, in announcing the birth of Christ, said: "And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS." And in Luke 2:21, we read, "And when eight days were accomplished for the

circumcising of the child, his name was called JESUS, which was so named of the angel before he was conceived in the womb." So, if the modern custom of calling the wife by the name of her husband should determine the name of the Church, then it would be Mrs. Jesus, or the Jesus Church! Then the people would be called Jesusites, or Jesuites. But this would be invading the precincts of a Catholic order by that name.

But, if it is still urged that the Church should call herself by Christ's official name, contrary to the ordinary rules of propriety, then suffice it to say that it is not customary for a bride to wear the name of her husband before they are married. And, as, in Revelation, the marriage of the Lamb is represented as yet future, it would be becoming in the Church, as the bride before the marriage, that she be NOT TOO FAST, about wearing His name.

The average Campbellite preacher claims to preach nothing but the Bible. He exhorts the people to unite with him on the Bible, till he grows hoarse with the exhortation. He sweats and tugs over the name. He labors in pious tones. He entreats the people in the name of

Jehovah and in the precious name of Christ, to just come and unite with him on the Bible name. And the gullible people never dream that the pretended Bible name is no where to be found in the Word of God, and that a pious fraud is being enacted before their eyes. If some member of his beloved congregation should speak up, at this stage of his game, and say, please sir, give us the passage in the Bible in which the name Christian Church is to be found, he would surely grow calm in his effort to find an answer. And the multitude would discover that all this ado about the name is only a cheat.

Webster defines the word Christian to signify :

1st. One who professes to believe, or is assumed to believe in the religion of Christ; especially one whose inward and outward life is conformed to the doctrines of Christ.

2d. One who is born in a Christian country, or of Christian parents.

Strictly speaking, then, a Christian is a true believer in Christ. And in a secondary sense, those persons born in Christian countries, or of Christian parents, are called Christians. And this, too, without any particular reference to the people of any one religious denomination. That

is to say, it is a word of general application, that it is not restricted to race, nation, denomination, sect, or party. And time has so chrystalized these definitions that they are unalterable. They have stood the test of ages, and are destined to attach to the word to the end of time. Any attempt, therefore, to so change the meaning of the word Christian as to make it signify what are called Campbellites, is a folly equivalent to madness. . But nothing less can be meant. We will show this by analogy.

Should the American people claim that they are the human race? And should we, as a nation, proceed to notify other nations that Human is our name? that we are the human race? And should we repudiate the name of Americans, and demand that other nations shall call us the Human nation ; and speak of us as the human race? Should we become indignant at every refusal of other nations to call us the Human Government? Should we wax hot for war, whenever they called us Americans and notify them that there is one way by which they can become human ; that if they shall surrender their national independence, and their flags to us, and become part of this Human government, that

then they would be of the human kind? And, should other nations refuse to surrender, but for the sake of cowardly policy, should pronounce for us, by speaking of us as the Human race? And then we should turn around and say to them, yes, we are human, but you are Mexicans, Dutch, French, English, and heathen Chinese.

Now attention, reader, while we draw the points in the foregoing analogy :

1st. The word Human is a generic word, applied to the whole race of man. So the word Christian is of as wide import as the Christian profession.

2d. The word American is a specific word, used to describe a certain people. So is the word Campbellites.

3d. The Americans are so called from *Americus Vesputius*. The Campbellites are so called from Alexander Campbell.

4th. The Americans claim to be human. So do other nations. The Campbellites profess to be Christians. So do other denominations.

5th. The Americans were supposed, in the analogy, to claim to repudiate the word American, as applied to them. The Campbellites claim to repudiate the word Campbellite, as applied to them.

6th. The Americans were supposed to claim the right to appropriate the word human, as describing themselves. The Campbellites claim the right to appropriate the word Christian as describing themselves. In Campbellite communities they often speak of themselves as "The Christians." Their preachers exhort other professed Christians to unite with them under the alleged right name of "The Christian Church," as though that were the way to become entitled to the name Christian.

7th. In the analogy the other nations were supposed to refuse to surrender to the Americans; but for poor policy called them the Human race. It is a fact that some people of other denominations, who have not entirely surrendered to the Campbellites, do, for poor policy, call them the Christian Church.

8th. It was supposed that when the other nations called the Americans the Human Government, that the American people, through their representatives, turned around and said yes, we are human, but you are Mexicans, Dutch, French, English and Chinese. And it a well known fact, that when other people have called the Campbellites the Christian Church, that their preachers

have said, "We are Christians; but you are Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians," etc.

But we will carry the analogy a little further.

So our 9th shall be, that the Americans are a new people, as a nation; and the Campbellites are a new people as a denomination.

10th. Suppose that the American government assumes that because she calls herself the Human Government, and her people the human race, that she is entitled to all the credit for all the noble deeds and chivalrous attainments of all the human race, from Adam down to the present time. If our government were given to such fancies, she might claim that all nations were hers because they were human, and human because they were hers, and this through all the ages prior to her own existence; but that when she came on the arena she abstracted and sponged out all that was human in all other nations. Then she might claim that other nations were not entitled to the common rights of humanity.

Campbellism makes as big a splurge as this. She claims that Peter and Paul and Mark and Luke, and all the apostles, and all the disciples of the apostolic age and of all the intervening ages, were members of this so-called Christian

Church, because they were Christians. In this manner the Campbellites claim that to them belongs the credit of planting the gospel in every land where its benificent rays have illuminated and elevated mankind; and that their's are all the Christian martyrs of all ages. Though there is no evidence that Campbellites have ever shed one drop of their blood for their religion, unless some of them have chanced to such an accident as to be scratched by a briar, while laboring to promote Campbellism.

In Acts 11:26 we read that "The disciples were called Christians first in Antioch;" and in Acts 26:28 that "Agrippa said unto Paul, Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian," and in 1. Pet. 4:16, "If any man suffer as a Christian let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God on this behalf." This is the sum of what is said in the New Testament Scriptures about the name Christian. And concerning the Bible argument for the name we make the following observations: 1st. At Antioch was the first time that the disciples were called Christians. This was about the year A. D. 43. Had the name Christian been so important a part of gospel teaching as it is of Campbellite teaching, then the disciples would

certainly have been called Christians before this time. In all the preaching of John the Baptist, of Jesus, and of all the apostles up to this time (ten years after the Pentecostal occasion), not one word is said concerning the name Christian. Indeed, it is evident that this name is no essential part, whatever, of gospel teaching. Even Campbellites themselves will agree that the gospel had been preached before this time. They date the beginning of the gospel on the day of Pentecost, ten years before this time. But if the gospel had been preached before the name Christian had been applied to the disciples (and it certainly had, Campbellites themselves being witnesses), then it is certain that this name constitutes no part of gospel teaching. And if it had been, in any respect, an essential name, surely our Lord would not have left it out of His teaching, nor would He have left this name to go forth from a heathen city. For it was written that the word of the Lord shall go forth from Jerusalem and not from Antioch.

2d. The disciples were first called Christians at Antioch. They did not first call themselves Christians. They were passive in acquiring this name. This shows that the disciples of Antioch

were not of the sort we call Campbellites. For these Campbellite disciples are always first and most constant in calling themselves Christians. At this time the people of Antioch were partly Christian and partly heathen ; and it is reasonable to suppose that the greater part were heathen. And inasmuch as the disciples did not first call themselves Christians, and as it is evident that this name did not proceed by inspiration from God, we are forced to the conclusion that the disciples were first called Christians as a term of reproach, by the heathen Antiochians. But as the name, in itself, was not objectionable, but appropriate, it has been accepted by the professed disciples of Christ in all subsequent ages.

3d. The word Christian was of so little consequence that it is mentioned but twice after this in the New Testament Scriptures. One of these times it is merely historically mentioned as having been used by King Agrippa. And it was probably then used as a term of stinging reproach. And Peter once incidentally mentioned the name in the language : “ If any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed.” This language itself would seem to indicate that it was used as a term of reproach. We think the passage might

be properly paraphrased as follows: If any man suffer under the reproachful name of Christian, let him not be ashamed, but let him rather glorify God on this account. For while it is used as a name of reproach among men, the word Christian pertains to Christ, who is the Lord's anointed and the Prince of the kings of the earth.

So then, reader, while we should not be ashamed of any sufferings which we may endure under the name of Christian, but should even glorify God on this account; still there is not even one inspired intimation that it is our duty to call ourselves the Christian Church. But as to this name, the Christian Church, let all the house of Israel know assuredly **THAT THE BIBLE IS AS SILENT AS THE GRAVE CONCERNING IT.**

CHAPTER III.

THE NAME.—CONTINUED.

“And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch,” Acts 11 : 26.

Those who pervert this text are giving great trouble to our Zion. They are burdening the pages of their literature with what we conceive to be a false interpretation, and hundreds of the simple-minded among us have been led into apostasy from the faith by this slight and cunning craftiness. So far has this matter been urged that the wearing of this name “Christian,” is made a *SINE QUA NON* of one’s salvation.

Prof. McGarvey, one of the brightest lights in the school of Alexander Campbell, says in his Commentary : “This question demands the most solemn and trembling consideration of this generation.”

“A card before me, largely circulated throughout our borders, intimates that one cannot be saved who refuses to wear this name. It is urged as the basis of union for all religions, regardless of doc-

trinal differences, and moral and spiritual qualifications. And many of our members, as well as members of other denominations, who properly love the idea of union, accept the foolish proposition of wearing the ecclesiastical name "Christian" as the all-sufficient antidote for ecclesiastical divisions and schisms. We need not say that the last end of such persons will be worse than the first. It is a subterfuge designed to make merchandise of professors of religion, and the deception should be exposed. From the ways in which this subject is thrust upon the credulous and unintelligent of all denominations, one would be led to believe there is a positive command from heaven for all to wear this name as the panacea for all divisions and strifes, and that this command is to be found on every page of the inspired book, and was designed to abolish all other names, and by the wearing of this one name, all differences of opinion might be ignored. Of course, the proposition is too puerile to receive a dignified notice. An intelligent man can see, that if the proposition was accepted, so that all denominational lines would be obliterated, and all differences ignored, that it would be but the successful execution of a satanic scheme, that would soon

shake the world with a religious earthquake such as never was since the world was, no nor ever could be thereafter. It would be 'uniting the world to pieces, and reviving it to death.' Such a union would constitute but a brief millenium, for the satan of malevolence would soon leap from his ambush and 'the Gog and Magog of sectarian rivalry' would stir up the depths of *hades* with the tramping of their forces and the clangor of their arms. A holy God would look upon the hypocritical alliance with infinite abhorrence, and the language concerning the whited sepulcher would be the sheerest flattery. Satan never devised a scheme so pregnant with evil, and that would prove so fatal to the cause of Christ. It spits in the face of that unanswerd and unanswerable question of Omniscience—'How can two walk together, except they be agreed?' It would trample under foot those many solemn, positive commands, to withdraw from every one who walks disorderly and not according to the doctrine received by us. It is equivalent to saying, you need not be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment. Indeed the boast is made of unbounded liberty in all things, just so we are united in *name*, and in the belief of

one proposition—that Jesus is the Son of God. Of course the Devil and his angels would be the first to join the compact, for they have already confessed the proposition, and they are intensely in favor of being united in *name* and not in reality, and all who preach such doctrine are the ministers of satan, though they be transformed as the angels of light.”

We have made this long quotation from a tract by Elder J. B. Moody, on “The Name Christian,” as showing the tremendous importance attached to the name Christian, by the so-called Christian Church, as well as to help the reader to see the fallacy of the plea for this name.

In the Bible, God’s people are called Believers, Saints, Disciples, Elect, Sanctified, Chosen, Beloved of God, Friends, Brethren, etc. Suppose some one should set up a new denomination and its members should call themselves Saints, and then call on the members of other denominations to unite with them on this right name. And suppose they denounce the members of the other denominations and say, you are Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, etc., but we are SAINTS; and ours is the SAINTS’ CHURCH. This would be silly. But no

more so than are the Campbellites over the names Christian and Christian Church.

Christ called His disciples Sheep. See John 10th chapter. Now the Sheep is a good animal and Sheep is a good name. Our Lord used it and applied it to His disciples. And He would not do anything but what is good and right. Suppose, therefore, we call ourselves Sheep; and our Church the Sheep Church, and then be forever bleating around about our name, and calling on the members of other denominations to unite with us on this Bible name—the Sheep Church. That would be silly, too. But it would be like the Campbellites over the name Christian Church.

In the ninth chapter of the letter to the Romans, we read: “And it shall come to pass, *that* in the place where it was said unto them, Ye *are* not my people; there shall they be called the children of the living God.” That applies to us gentiles who believe. And bless the Lord for it. But suppose we call ourselves Children, and our Church the Children Church; and then call on our neighbors to unite with us on this Bible name. There are religious sects enough in the world to appropriate all the names in the Bible, by which God has seen fit to call His people. Would this

transform them into Scriptural churches? No, No! Away with such nonsense!

We submit the testimony of eminent authors and critics on the origin of the name Christian, as follows:

Livermore, in commenting on Acts 11:26, upon the words, "The disciples were called Christians first at Antioch," says:

"This remarkable fact has called forth a variety of questions, as to the origin and intention of the name. The followers of Christ did not, probably, themselves originate this designation; for, both before and after this time, they went under the title of disciples, chapter 1:15, 20:7; believers, chapter 5:14, 1 Tim. 4:12; saints, chapter 9:13, 26:10; brethren, chapter 6:3, 28:14; the church, chapter 2:47, 15:22; the men of this way, chapter 9:2, 22:4. Only two cases besides the present occur, in the New Testament, where the word Christian is used, and in one of those it is employed by Agrippa, chapter 26:28, and in the other by Peter, as if it were a term of reproach, used by enemies, 1 Pet. 4:16. If it had arisen among the disciples themselves, it would naturally have been more generally used."

A Bible Dictionary, bound with the Mitchell & Dinwiddie Bible, says :

“Christian : followers of the highest and best known divine laws as taught by Jesus Christ. The name Christian was given to the disciples of Jesus, at Antioch, by the Greeks in derision, in the reign of Claudius. They were before that called Nazarenes and Gallileans.”

Abbott's Notes on the New Testament, says :

“Called Christians ; by their enemies. The sacred writers themselves never employ the term to designate the followers of Christ, excepting that Peter uses it in one instance, in a connection which allows it to be considered a term of reproach.” (1 Pet. 4 : 16.)

Watson's Bible Dictionary says :

“Christian, a follower of the religion of Christ. It is probable that the name Christian, like that of Nazarenes and Gallileans, was given to the disciples of our Lord in reproach or contempt. What confirms this opinion is, that the people of Antioch in Syria, Acts 11 : 26, where they were first called Christians are observed by Zosimus, Procopius and Zonaras, to have been remarkable for their scurrilous jesting. Some have indeed thought that this name was given by the

disciples to themselves: others that it was imposed on them by divine authority, in either of which cases surely we should have met with it in the subsequent history of the Acts, and in the Apostolic epistles, all of which were written some years after; whereas it is found in but two more places in the New Testament, Acts 26: 28, where a Jew is the speaker, and in 1 Pet. 4: 16, where reference appears to be made to the name as imposed upon them by their enemies. The word used Acts 11:26 signifies simply to be called or named, and when Doddridge and a few others take it to imply a Divine appointment, they disregard the *usus loquendi* (established acceptance of the term) which gives no support to that opinion. The words of Tacitus, when speaking of the Christians persecuted by Nero, are remarkable ‘*Vulgus Christianos appellabat,*’ ‘the vulgar called them Christians.’ Epiphanius says they were called Jesseans, either from Jesse, the father of David, or, which is much more probable, from the name of Jesus, whose disciples they were. They were denominated Christians, A. D. 42 or 43 and, though the name was first given reproachfully, they gloried

in it as expressing their adherence to Christ, and they soon generally assumed it."

Smith's Bible Dictionary says: "Christian. The disciples, we are told, (Acts 11:26), were first called Christians at Antioch on the Orontes, somewhere about A. D. 43. The name and the place where it was conferred are both significant. It is clear that the appellation 'Christian' was one which could not have been assumed by the Christians themselves. * * * * To the contemptuous Jew they were Nazarenes and Galileans, names which carried with them the infamy and turbulence of the places whence they sprung, and from whence nothing good and no prophet might come. The Jews could add nothing to the scorn which these names expressed, and had they endeavored to do so they would not have defiled the glory of their Messiah by applying his title to those whom they could not but regard as the followers of a pretender. The name 'Christian,' then, which, in the only other cases where it appears in the New Testament (Acts 26:28; 1 Pet. 4:16; Comp. Tac. Ann. 15:44), is used contemptuously, could not have been applied by the early disciples to themselves; nor could it have come to them from their own nation, the Jews; it must,

therefore, have been imposed upon them by the Gentile world, and no place could have so appropriately given rise to it as Antioch, where the first church was planted among the heathen. Its inhabitants were celebrated for their wit and a propensity for conferring nicknames.”

Hear, now, the testimony of two of the fathers, who lived near the time when the name Christian was conferred, Tacitus, Ann. 15: 44, says: “Nero punished with refined cruelty those whom the vulgar called ‘Christians.’ Chrysostom, who preached in this very city, said of its wicked inhabitants: ‘Although they had invented the Christian name, they left to others the practice of the Christian virtues.’” In Moody on the name Christian, page 11.

It was the vulgar who called the disciples Christians at the first. And the heathen inhabitants of Antioch invented the name. We endorse the following language of Bro. J. B. Moody in his tract on the name Christian, pp. 11 to 14: “Now, reader, what think you of the ASSERTION, repeated times and ways past finding out, for a space of fifty years, by a people claiming Bible intelligence, that it is not only a name divinely appointed, but a name divinely appointed to pluck

up and swallow up all other names, and not only so, but also all manner of doctrines and characters as well. And remember the witnesses, excepting Mr. Campbell, were not under the influence of debate, for they never felt the agitation created by this new sect."

"How can the reader escape the conviction that these boastful teachers are at fault, either in their intelligence or sincerity? Seeing now that their foundation is sand, let us see what sort of superstructure they have reared upon it. Let us see how and what they have foolishly built, then let us blow upon it and it will fall. Notice some of the silly sophisms deduced from this false premise, and you will see something of the foolishness of these builders. They falsely assume that this is a divinely appointed name, and then they style themselves the 'Christian Church.' They write and speak it in season and out: you find it in superscription over their church doors, and after naming themselves the 'Christian Church,' they claim therefore they are the Church of Christ; making these two expressions synonymous. But are they synonymous? Let us put it in the form of an equation. That Christ's church equal church of Christ is certain, and none

will dispute it. But does Christian church equal Church of Christ. Let us first apply the process of elimination by cancelling the common factor or term 'church.' That leaves Christian equal Christ. And this they claim is true, when they say in taking the name Christian, they wear *His* name. Then Christian is the name of Christ, or Christian equal Christ. Does this fulfil the prophecy, 'Many will come saying, I am Christ?' This they do, if Christian is his name, and this they assert. Seeing now the result of elimination, let us apply the principle of substitution. Then the equations will stand :

Christian patience equals patience of Christ ;
Christian suffering equals suffering of Christ ;
Christian work equals work of Christ ;
Christian life equals life of Christ ;
Christian love equals love of Christ ;
Christian blood equals blood of Christ ;
Christian death equals death of Christ ;
Christian mother equals mother of Christ ;
Christian church equals church of Christ ;
Christian minister equals minister of Christ .

But it is clear that Christian patience is not the patience of Christ ; Christian suffering is not the suffering of Christ ; Christian work is not the

work of Christ; Christian life is not the life of Christ; Christian love is not the love of Christ; Christian blood is not the blood of Christ; Christian death is not the death of Christ: Christian mother is not the mother of Christ; Christian church is not the church of Christ; Christian minister is not the minister of Christ."

"But let us advance on another position. It is claimed that Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, &c., being human names, and names of human beings, that therefore Baptist church, &c., cannot be the Church of Christ, but a human church, and a church of human beings. But is there not a single one out of these half million people wise enough to see that the identical, self-same thing is true of 'Christian?' Is not 'Christian' a human name, and name of a human being? Baptists are human beings, Christians are human beings. Then how can Baptist church be a human church, and Christian church be anything else? How can the principle work one time and reverse itself the other? Is Christian the name of Christ? It has been so stated times without number. In the card before me I read: 'Shame on you! shall a wife wear another than her husband's name? This time the Master is crucified by his friends.'

Again, in answering the question that many have gone to heaven wearing human names, the answer is, 'Not if they knew them to be wrong. No man can be saved who persists in wearing a human name, when he knows the word of God condemns it. This is a serious question.' This is a sample of cart loads of such stuff. It is passing strange that a people who are intelligent on other subjects are to be found, who could speak, write, read and believe such nonsense. 'The bride ought to wear the husband's name.' Then the husband's name is Christian, for the one this shameless, so-called bride is wearing, is Christian. Then her husband is a Christian. She says Alexander Campbell was a Christian. She dare not say that Christ is. Then A. Campbell must be the husband of this wife. But he is now dead, and she is released from the law of her husband, and may be married to another. Oh! that I could espouse her to one husband, even Christ; then would she have modesty enough to wait till the seven seals are opened, and the seven trumpets sounded, and the seven vials of wrath emptied; until Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen; until he has avenged the blood of his saints and prophets on her that corrupted the earth with

her fornication. Then the kingdoms of this world will become the kingdom of our Lord and his Christ. Then the marriage of the lamb will have come, and his wife will make herself ready, and to her shall be granted that she shall be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white, and she will be glad and rejoice and give honor to him. (Rev. 19:7-9 and Ps. 45:13-15). 'SHAME ON YOU!' Shall a betrothed bride wear the name of the husband before the wedding? Would the husband live with a woman who persisted in wearing his name in adjective form? Was Daguerre's wife named Daguerrean? Was Newton's wife named Newtonian? Is Smith's wife named Smithsonian? Is Christ's wife named Christian? 'Shame on you!' Is not 'Christian another than the husband's name?' Do not all the wives in the world wear the exact name of their husbands? And since you say your church is not even an organization, then each of you is a Christ! For individually you claim to wear his name. 'Many shall come in my name,' said Christ. This makes a half million of false Christs, and the prophecy is fulfilled in you."

The foregoing, from Moody's tract on the name is severe, but well deserved. This deceitful pre-

tense about the name is wicked and deserves, like Agag, to be hewn to pieces with the sharp edge of truth.

CHAPTER IV.

CAMPBELLITE TROUBLE AND CONFUSION OVER
THE NAME.

Take the following for example: "Some time since the *Republican* announced the death of Rev. Mr. Challen, designating him as a Campbellite clergyman. The *Christian*, the recognized organ of the denomination to which he belonged, takes exception to the designation, and says: 'We do not think the *Republican* intended any disrespect, either to the deceased or to the cause to which he devoted his long and useful life. But it is time that the secular papers of this country knew better than to allude in such terms to a large and respectable religious body, and then attempt to justify it on the ground that its readers would not have understood what it meant had it used the name by which they prefer to be distinguished.'"

The *Republican* replied: "We dislike exceedingly to contradict the emphatic assertion of a religious newspaper. Nevertheless, we must venture to affirm that, the people of this country 'do not'

understand what is meant by the 'Disciples,' or 'Christian Church' when applied to a distinguished religious body, as clearly as they understand the terms 'Methodist,' 'Baptist,' etc. * * * We doubt whether in any mixed company of ordinary intelligent persons, two out of fifty can be found who know that the sect founded by Alexander Campbell is called 'Disciples'; or more than five out of fifty who know that the sect is also called the 'Christian Church.' In the same company every person will know who and what is meant by 'Methodists' and 'Baptists.' When 'the people of this country' have the knowledge which the *Christian* credits them with, 'the secular papers of this country' will be glad to use one or the other, or both, of the names the *Christian* prefers. Until popular knowledge reaches this point, the *Republican*, in common with the rest of 'the secular press' will have to conform to popular ignorance. Moreover, we fail to see the slightest disrespect in the word Campbellite. Alexander Campbell was a man of whom any sect may well be proud, and he has impressed his individuality so strongly on the organization which owes its origin to him, that it is never likely to lose his name. The followers of John Wesley do not

scorn the name of Methodists, though it was at first applied to them in bitter reproach. They have made it not only honorable, but illustrious; and if the religious body which the Christian represents is sensible, it will profit by their example." *Daily Republican*, 1877, quoted in *Gospel in Water*, pp. 69-71.

We have a rich example, as follows: "In March, 1882," Elder Wm. McNutt "Wrote to the '*Banner and Gleaner*.' This day in the town of Blandinsville, McDonough County, Ill., the truth forced itself upon a Campbellite convention, thirty two ministers present. A grand convocation of all their ministers in the 'military tract' between the Illinois and the Mississippi Rivers, in council assembled. In regular programme of business, Elder E. J. Lampton, of Camp Point, Ill., read a paper entitled, 'The Name of the People of God.' The house was crowded. We had a seat near the stand, where we could catch every word, with paper and pencil in hand. The writer of the paper had seen the trouble, and approached the name very cautiously and very faintly made it by inference, said: 'We have manufactured the name Christian Church.' Eyes were snapping in every direction. One upon

another and upon me, and my eyes snaped, too. When the reader had sat down, Elder F. Walden, of Old Bedford, opened the discussion by asking the reader: 'If a reporter in Kansas were to ask you what you called your name what would you tell him? Making Church Statistics, what name would you give him?' Here was a dead-lock. The whole convention saw it and felt it. A modest blush rose on all cheeks as the truth pressed itself home to all, that this child had to be named. Many names were tried, but all were rejected. 'Christian Church' was pronounced unscriptural and sectarian. There was learning and talent in this convention. Some two or three colleges were represented by their presidents and professors. The Greek Testament was brought to bear; but a name for this child could not be found in English or Greek. President F. M. Bruner, Abington, said: 'Any name that would indicate that the church was of human origin, would be dishonoring.' Elder Pinkerton, of Eureka, said: 'There are several churches in this place, Methodists, Baptists, and perhaps Presbyterians. What Church is this?' A finer blush never sat on the face of a sixteen-year-old girl, than played on all faces. While this question

was pending, some one proposed the name of 'The Church,' but Elder Tricket, one of the most scholarly, said: 'That will be arrogant; some may take it, I wont.' Elder C. H. Caton, of McComb, said: 'We are not back to primitive character. What are we to be called until we get back?' Just as he said that he threw his eyes on me, and said: 'Let us quit discussing the name until we get back to primitive character. There sits the Baptist pastor, Elder McNutt. I have seen him in debate with our brethren on Church identity. I never want to see it again until we agree among ourselves; and then he is taking items now.' [A general laugh, as I sounded it out, yes, I have them.] The adjournment came on, and the child is not yet named. Think of it. Here we are in the nineteenth century, and Christ's Church in its infancy, laid in the lap of a convention to be named! Oh, my brethren, the Lord can beat us in the controversy with the Campbellites. When He has a controversy with men He makes them tell it. Campbellism has found itself 'where two ways meet.' The literature of the world has established the name for them, Campbellite. They see the point, and to obscure this human head or founder, they

must go back on Campbell, and try to place his name on the background, while the spirit of Campbell says: 'Without me ye do nothing.' " Gospel in Water, pp. 75, 76-77.

Some Campbellites are as much opposed to the name "Christian Church," as others are in favor of it. It is a notorious fact that Alexander Campbell was strongly opposed to this name. He says: "I am bold to affirm, in the face of all criticism, that there is not the least authority in the word here used (*Chrematiso*) for concluding that the name Christian came from God, any more than from Antiochus Epiphanes! This may be too strong for some who contend that the name Christian is of divine authority, but let them put me to the proof. That it was neither given by dream, oracle, angel nor apostle is, in my judgment, by far the more probable opinion."

Oh, ye disciples, listen; Mr. Campbell speaks again. He says: "Not to lose sight of the subject before us, with us it is a strong argument that had the churches been first called Christians by DIVINE APPOINTMENT at Antioch, then the apostles would have addressed the disciples by this divinely-appointed name. But this they did not so much as ONCE in any public document which has

come down to us. The Antiochians called the disciples first Christians; Agrippa used the term once in reference to himself; and Peter said that if any man was indicted as a Christian, or if any man suffered as a Christian, let him not be ASHAMED; which argues that it was under this name their enemies persecuted and traduced them. But no document has come down to us authorizing us to think that this name Christian was regarded by any of the apostles as of divine appointment. If Paul in any of his letters—if Peter, James or John had only ONCE said: ‘To the Christians in Rome, Corinth, Galatia, Greece, Asia, Judea,’ or anywhere else, then, indeed, there might have been some ground to think that they regarded it as of divine appointment! And, recollect it was fifty years and more from the time they were first called Christians before all the New Testament was written. They are called Disciples, Saints, Believers, the Called, Sanctified, in the Acts and in the Epistles, but never once addressed under the name Christians. Now, let it be remembered, that we have no objection for the name Christian, if we only deserve it; nor predilection for the name DISCIPLE except for its antiquity and modesty; but when it [the

name Christian] is plead for as of divine authority, and as the only or most fitting name which can be adopted, we must lift our voice against the imposition and contend for the liberty, where the Lord has left us free.”

This contending for the name Christian as of Divine authority, is an imposition according to Mr. Campbell. Why, then, do so many of his disciples practice this imposition?

“Let us see how Mr. Campbell wrote two years later: Mil. Har. Vol. 4, page 24. ‘Have we any divine authority for being called Christians at all? Was the name Christian first given by heaven, or men? We may fearlessly affirm that no man can possibly prove that it was divinely introduced or sanctioned. Now if the name Christian had been given at Antioch 20 years before by divine command, what an ungodly man must Luke have been during these 20 years after, and 14 years before, in all 35 years, never to have called them Christians, but on the contrary waywardly and frowardly to have called them disciples all the time. Unless we suppose this man Luke to have been a bold and daring offender against a divine revelation, it is *infallibly certain* that he, and his companions, the apostles,

did not receive the name Christian as coming from God, but from the *rude* and *profane* Antiochians." Quoted in Moody on the Name Christian, pp. 8, 9.

"A Mr. Martin wrote in the *American Christian Review* (Campbellite) on 'The name of the Church.' In that he says: 'In the *Review*, of May 18, in reference to a card he had received from Bro. Elmore, says: But this card came from the Christian Church. Who can these people be? * * * * I wonder if this is not a 'Disciple Church?' Can Bros. Martin or Franklin tell? Since the Old Path Guide and the Review have been searching for the Church, may be they can enlighten us as to these people and their faith and object?' * * * * There is, perhaps, no question about which our people are more divided than that of the name."

"Mr. Martin continues: 'We believe the name a vital question, and yet we have come to no general conclusion as to what the name is.' Gospel in Water, pp. 78, 79.

A VITAL QUESTION. This means one essential to life. In the estimation of Campbellites, their salvation depends on their having the right name.

And yet they can't come to any "general CONCLUSION AS TO WHAT THE NAME IS."

Campbellites say that the Bible is all-sufficient for doctrine. And we agree with them that it is. If our salvation depends on our having the right name, then the Bible would teach us what it is. Why, then, don't the Campbellites just look into the Bible and find that "vital" name, wear it on their heads, and march up to glory?

Mr. Martin also says: "So divided are we upon this question that the census-takers cannot ascertain who we are, what we believe, or our numbers." "In Kentucky and in the South we are the Christian Church; in the West we are the Christian Church and the Church of Christ; in Ohio, Pennsylvania and New York we are the Disciples, and often the Disciple Church; and in New England we are the Disciples and the Church of Christ. Christian Church is seldom heard among us in New England, because there is another church more numerous than we are, called by that name." Gos. in Wat., p. 79.

"The *Christian Record* of October, 1868. p. 290, edited by J. M. Mathes, a leading Campbellite, says: 'But Dr. Merrill makes a false issue with us by representing us as contending that the

proper Scriptural designation of the Church is Christian Church. Who has contended for this, Dr.? We know of no well-informed man among us who contends for any such thing.' ”

“Again, in the same paper, of January, 1869, p. 44, Mathes said: ‘There is some little matter in the editor’s prospectus that we regret to see.

* * * But we call Bro. Moore’s attention especially to it. It is the following: Managing editor W. T. Moore, pastor of the Walnut Street Christian Church, Cincinnati. Where in the New Testament does Bro. W. T. Moore find the Church of Christ called the Christian Church? Evidently nowhere. The phrase is unscriptural and sectarian.” Elder A. Martin, then of Centralia, Ill., said: ‘Christian Church is a misnomer.’ ” *Record and Evangelist*, June 1st, 1876. All quoted in *Gosp. in Wat.*, pp. 79, 80.

What a fix the Campbellites are in over the name. Most of them compassing land and sea to make proselytes under the name of the Christian Church, and others disowning this name, and some even denying that any of them have ever contended for it. These people say the Bible reveals everything they need to know in religion. They need to know the right name; for they say

the name is "a vital question." That is, their salvation depends upon it. Yet they do not know, according to their own testimony, what the right name is. For various parties among them contend for various names, and this is proof positive that they don't know what is the right name. But a people who don't know their own name are in a poor plight to teach others how to be saved, by being called by the right name.

CHAPTER V.

THE SO-CALLED CHRISTIAN CHURCH CANNOT BE THE
CHURCH OF CHRIST, BECAUSE IT IS TOO
YOUNG AND TOO ROMISH.

Campbellism is a stream which has proceeded from two principal and kindred sources. These were Alexander Campbell and Barton W. Stone. Both of these men were Presbyterians. Presbyterianism, like most of the Pede-Baptistisms, has proceeded from Romanism, and carries a taint of the old Romish doctrine of baptismal salvation. John Calvin said: "We ought to conclude that whatever time we are baptized we are washed and purified for the whole life. * * * * I know that it is the common opinion that remission of sins, which at our first regeneration we receive by baptism alone," etc. Inst. Chr. Relig., Vol. 2, pp. 478, 479. Quoted in Gospel in Water, page 5.

Mathew Henry says: "Baptism wrests the key of the heart out of the strong man armed, that the possession may be surrendered to him whose

right it is. The water of baptism is designed for cleansing from the spots and defilements of the flesh. In Baptism our names are engraved upon the breast plate of the high priest. This is the efficacy of baptism; it is putting the child's name into the gospel grant. We are baptized in Christ's stead; that is, God doth, in that ordinance seal, confirm and make over to us all the benefits of the death of Christ."

"Commenting [on Eph. 5:26, Matt. Henry says: 'The instrumental means whereby this is effected'—i. e., the soul saved—are the sacraments, particularly the washing of baptism and the preaching and the reception of the gospel.'"

Dwight, in this System of Theology, says: "When children die in infancy and are Scripturally dedicated to God in baptism, there is much and very consoling reason furnished to believe that they are accepted beyond the grave."

"Dr. Nevins, formerly a professor at Princeton, says: "The Church makes us Christians by the sacrament of baptism, which she always held to be of supernatural force, for that very purpose."

Dr. Hodge says: "We are baptized in order that we may be united to Christ, and be made partakers of his benefits. Thus baptism unto

repentance is a baptism that the remission of sins may be obtained.’”

“In *The Gospel in Ezekiel*, Dr. Guthrie, one of the greatest Presbyterian writers, says: ‘Prone, as we of Scotland are to boast of our fathers, with Knox at their head, came forth from Rome with less of her old superstition than most other churches, to what else than some lingering remains of Popery can we ascribe the extreme anxiety which some parents show to have baptism administered to a dying child? Does not this look like a rag of the old faith? It smells of the Sepulchre. * * * * Is there not reason to suspect that at the root of this anxious and unnecessary haste there lies some lurking feeling that baptism, if not essential, is at least serviceable to salvation, and has connection, near or remote, with regeneration or remission of sins.’”

“William Anderson, LL.D., one of the ablest of recent Presbyterian writers, says: ‘There is yet detectable among our Presbyterian population an impure leaven of the superstition of water-baptism sanctification.’”

The foregoing Presbyterian authorities are copied, as quoted in *Gospel in Water*. pp. 5 to 20.

The Presbyterian Confession of Faith, chapter on baptism, articles 5 and 6, says: "Although it be a great sin to condemn or neglect this ordinance, yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated. The efficacy of baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered; yet, notwithstanding, by the right use of *this ordinance* the grace promised is not only offered, but *really exhibited* and *conferred* by the Holy Ghost to such, (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God's own will in his appointed time." (Our italics.)

The Presbyterian larger catechism, in answer to question 154, uses the following language: "The outward and ordinary means whereby Christ communicates to his Church the benefits of his mediation, are all his ordinances; especially the Word, sacraments and prayer; all which are made effectual to the elect for their salvation."

Shorter Presbyterian Chatechism, questions and answers 91, 92 and 93 contain the following:

"Q. How do the sacraments become effectual means of salvation?

A. The sacraments become effectual means of salvation, not from any virtue in them, or in him that doth administer them; but only by the blessing of Christ and the working of his Spirit in them that by faith receive them.

Q. What is a sacrament?

A. Sacrament is a holy ordinance instituted by Christ, wherein, by sensible signs Christ and the benefits of the new covenant are represented, sealed and applied to believers.

Q. Which are the sacraments of the New Testament?

A. The sacraments of the New Testament are, baptism and the Lord's Supper."

Mr. Stone said of A. Campbell: "I saw no distinctive feature between the doctrine he preached and the doctrine we had preached for many years, except on baptism for the remission of sins. Even this I had once received and taught, as before stated, but had strangely let it go from my mind till Bro. Campbell revived it afresh." Life of B. W. Stone, by Mathes, p. 29. Quoted in Gospel in Water, p. 21.

If we take into consideration that both the Campbells and Stone, the prime movers in the origination of the so-called Christian Church,

were Presbyterians, and that Presbyterianism carries the doctrine of baptismal salvation as an old rag of Romanism, we need not be astonished if Campbellism be found bandying this old rag; though it "smells of the" Romish "sepulchre" from which it was taken.

Alexander Campbell did not originate the peculiar collection of doctrines that are distinctively denominated Campbellism. He got them from Sandeman and Glas and their followers in Scotland. It had been generally believed until recently, that Mr. Campbell had formulated or discovered these doctrines; and that he collected them into a cluster, and was the first to promulgate them. But this is not the case. A flood of light has recently been turned on this subject by Wm. H. Whitsitt, Professor in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, in a work entitled "Origin of the Disciples of Christ," or "Campbellites." In this work it is shown, by many and incontestable proofs, that Mr. Campbell acted the part of a copyist in his doctrines, and in the very phraseology by which he sought to propagate them. The patent Campbellite expressions, "The ancient order of things," and "Where the Bible speaks we speak, where the Bible is silent

we are silent," were imported by Alexander Campbell from Scotland to America. See Prof. Whitsitt's works as above.

Though Mr. Campbell was a mere copyist as to his views, he was a man of strong intellect and indomitable energy, and was certainly the founder of the so-called Christian Church, or the Campbellites, as a denomination. The origin of the so-called Christian Church is recent. Mr. Campbell, the founder of the so-called Christian Church, in an article prepared by him for Belcher's Religious Denominations, concerning them, says: "The rise of this society, if we only look back to the drawing of the lines of demarkation between it and other professors, IS OF RECENT ORIGIN." Relig. Denom., p. 801.

Prof. R. Richardson, an author of high repute among these people, says: "The religious society whose members prefer to be known by the primitive and unsectarian appellation of 'Disciples of Christ' or by that of 'Christians,' the title first given the followers of our Lord at Antioch, A. D. 41, but who are variously designated in different sections, as 'Baptists,' 'Reformed Baptists,' 'Reformers' or 'Campbellites,' had its origin in an effort made a few YEARS SINCE, to

effect a union of the pious of all parties, by the ties of a common Christianity.” *Relig. Denom. in U. S.* Published by De Silver. Edition of 1859, pp. 223-224.

W. T. Moore wrote in the *Living Pulpit*, published in 1869, as follows :

“ FIFTY YEARS HAVE NOT YET ELAPSED, and the little band of Disciples, who inaugurated the initial movement, and who were despised for their very insignificance, have grown to be one of the most powerful and influential religious people of modern times—numbering in the United States alone, not less than five hundred thousand communicants.”. *Liv. Pul.*, pp. 19-20.

The same writer, speaking of the work of Thomas Campbell, in 1807, says :

“ This was the BEGINNING of the great reformatory movement known as the ‘ Reformation of the Nineteenth Century.’ But Thomas Campbell and those who operated with him in Western Pennsylvania and Western Virginia were not alone in these efforts at a restoration of primitive Christianity. In Kentucky and Tennessee, Stone, Marshall, Thompson, Dunlevy and others, were zealously advocating the same principles. Under the influence of these movements, which had no

well defined organization, a latent force was excited, which has taken the body and form of what is now known as the Christian Church, or Disciples of Christ.” *Liv. Pul.*, p. 14.

Mr. Moore also wrote, in 1867: “The Disciples are just now passing through a TRANSITION STATE, and it will be interesting, in after years, to look over the great speeches of some of the representative men of this period.” *Liv. Pul.*, p. 31.

Hear the testimony also of Mr. D. S. Burnett, one of the bright lights of the Campbell School. He says: “Surrounded by a multitude of religious denominations, WITHIN THE LAST FORTY-FIVE YEARS a community has grown from ZERO to a half million, without a denominational aspect, and stands to-day without a human formula.” *Liv. Pul.*, p. 47.

In a Church Chart, published in 1879, by J. D. Arnold, G. W. Yancey, then pastor of the Campbellite Congregation, Corner Floyd and Chestnut Streets, Louisville, Ky., says: “The ‘current reformation’ properly began *in 1819*, when Alexander Campbell read his celebrated ‘Declaration and Address.’”

“Scarcely fifty years have transpired since the

reformatory movement began." A Campbellite in *Religious Denominations*, by Vincent L. Milner., p. 146. Edition of 1871.

We sum up the foregoing testimony as follows: Alexander Campbell says: "The rise of this society IS OF RECENT ORIGIN."

Prof. R. Richardson says it "HAD ITS ORIGIN in an effort made a FEW YEARS SINCE, to effect a union of the pious of all parties by the ties of common Christianity."

W. T. Moore says: "FIFTY YEARS HAVE NOT YET ELAPSED, and the little band of Disciples who INAUGURATED the INITIAL MOVEMENT, have grown to be one of the most powerful and influential religious people of modern times." And that "A LATENT force was excited which has taken the BODY AND FORM of what is now known as the CHRISTIAN CHURCH." And that they were just then "Passing through a transition state." Truth never passes through any transition states; though Campbellism does.

Mr. D. S. Burnett says: "WITHIN THE LAST FORTY-FIVE YEARS a community has grown FROM ZERO to a half million." Zero means nothing. They had grown from nothing, in forty-five years.

G. W. Yancey says: "The 'current reformation' properly began in 1819, when Alexander Campbell read his celebrated 'Declaration and Address.' "

Another Campbellite says: "*Scarce fifty years have transpired since the 'reformatory movement' began.*" (*Italics ours.*)

Now, we add the joint testimony of two more Campbellites, Joseph Franklin and J. A. Headington, authors of the "Life and Times of Benjamin Franklin," in proof that the so-called Christian Church is something new under the sun. Speaking of a controversy between Baptists and Pedo-Baptists, in the early part of this century, on page 22, they say: "This discussion was still in full blast when the reformation began and 'baptism for the remission of sins' was proclaimed. The storm of discussion which had raged on the 'subject' and 'action' of baptism, increased to a hurricane, when *a new party arose* and began to emphasize on the commission of the apostles, in which Jesus says: 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved,' on Peter's apostolic command on Pentecost, 'Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins,' and on

the command of Ananias to Saul, 'Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.' " (Our emphasis.)

So much for the testimony of Mr. Campbell and some of his most distinguished disciples, as to the recent origin of this so-called Christian Church, which claims the sole right to existence, as a religious denomination. See *Life and Times Benjamin Franklin*, p. 21.

The *American Cyclopædia*, pp. 463 and 464, says :

"Disciples of Christ, or, as they generally call themselves, Christians or Church of Christ, as a body of Christians frequently called Campbellites, taking the latter name from Alexander Campbell, one of their most distinguished Elders, and from his father, Rev. Thomas Campbell, a Scotch-Irish 'seceder,' who came to the United States in 1807, and with his son began to labor in Western Pennsylvania for the restoration of Christianity to apostolic practice. In 1811, they organized the Brush Run Church in Washinton County, Pa. In 1812, this Church adopted Baptist views, and in 1813 they, with other sister organizations, joined a Baptist association. But as the principles and practice of the Campbells and their followers were dis-

tasteful to many Baptists, much agitation followed, and in 1827 the Baptist Churches generally withdrew from fellowship with the reformers, who consequently organized themselves anew, professing to reject all creeds, and to receive the Bible alone as their authority in faith and practice." Johnson's Universal Cyclopædia.

"The Christian Connection, the Campbellites [or Disciples], and the Winebrennarians [or Church of God] are new organizations, drawn from various sources." American Cyclopædia. Vol. 2d, p. 293.

The so-called Christian Church had its origin recently, and in this nineteenth century, Mr. Campbell and many of his most renowned followers being witnesses. But the Church of Jesus Christ had its origin in the first century of the Christian era. It is, therefore, infallibly certain that this so-called Christian Church is not the Church of Christ.

CHAPTER VI.

CAMPBELLITES NOT THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, BE-
CAUSE THEY TEACH THE POPISH DOCTRINE
OF BAPTISMAL SALVATION.

J. Lewis Smith, of Zanesville, Ohio, wrote in the *American Baptist*: "The followers of A. Campbell have followed the Pope in putting baptismal salvation before Christ, and thus they hide Christ behind the water and tell the poor sinner to look to the water instead of away to Christ."

Is this so? Campbellites deny it. And yet we propose to show that if Campbellites do not teach Baptismal salvation, that Popery does not, and that language cannot be so used as to teach it.

G. W. Rice (Campbellite), in the *Octographic Review* of October 20th, 1887, says: "Immersion in water is the appointment of the great head of the Church for the purpose of imparting an assurance that the immersionist's sins are pardoned, no longer remembered against him, as testing his loyalty." Quoted in *American Baptist*.

According to this, immersion imparts assurance that sins are pardoned. And where sins are pardoned the soul is saved, of course.

Simpson Ely, a man of some notoriety and pastor of the so-called Christian Church of Kirksville, Mo., in trying to deny our allegation that his people teach baptismal salvation, said: "The question that I answered in the *Graphic* was this: 'As a body of Christian people do you believe that water washes away sins?'" "I answered in the negative, and Mr. Ray very well knows that all my brethren would negative such an absurd proposition. Not one of the illustrious names mentioned in his article ever believed for one moment that water washes away sins. They all believed that baptism in connection with the blood of Christ and with faith, repentance and confession, had its proper place in the work of salvation; but not one of them believed that baptism without its prerequisites could be of any possible benefit." *Kirksville Democrat*, May 20th, 1886.

Mr. Ely, in the language just quoted, confesses all we have ever affirmed against Campbellism concerning baptismal salvation. Yes, Campbellites believe "that baptism in connection with the

blood of Christ, and with faith, repentance and confession," has "its *proper place* in the work of salvation." And this "proper place" is the saving place. For Mr. Campbell says: "I do earnestly contend that God, through the blood of Christ, forgives our sins through immersion—through the very act and in the very instant; just as they say, God receives infants into the covenant or Church in the very act and in the very instant they are sprinkled." *Christian Baptist*, p. 454.

Again Mr. Campbell says: "It is as plainly affirmed in the New Testament that God forgives men's sins in the act of immersion as that he will raise the dead at the voice of the archangel, or as that Jesus Christ will come again to Judge the world." He further says: "I am bold, therefore, to affirm that every one of them (the Pentecostians) who, in the belief of what the apostle spoke, was immersed, did, in the very instant in which he was put under the water, receive the forgiveness of his sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit. If so, then, who will not concur with me in saying that Christian immersion is the gospel in water." *Christian Baptist*, pp. 416 and 417. Edition of 1835.

Mr. Campbell also says, *Christian Baptist*, p. 436: "He that goes down into the water to put on Christ in the faith that the blood of Jesus cleanses from all sin, and that he has appointed immersion as the medium and the act of ours, through and in which he actually and formally remits our sins, has, when immersed, the actual remission of sins. So that he is dead by sin, buried with Jesus, and is born again, or raised to life again, a life new and divine, in and through the act of immersion. This we have seen in the preceding essays is the Bible import of the one immersion. In it we put on Christ, are buried with him, rise with him, have our sins remitted, enter upon a new life, receive the Holy Spirit, and begin to rejoice in the Lord. * * * *
What! Say they, is a man to put on Christ, to be born again, to begin a new life, to rise with Christ to a heavenly inheritance, to have all his sins remitted, to receive the Holy Spirit, to be filled with joy and peace through the mere act of a believing immersion in water into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit? I say yea—most assuredly."

Again, Mr. Campbell says in *Christianity Restored*, pp. 220 and 221: "An efficacy is ascribed

to water which it does not possess ; and, as certainly, an efficacy is ascribed to blood which it does not possess. If blood can whiten or cleanse garments, certainly water can wash away sins. There is, then, a transferring of the efficacy of blood to water ; and a transferring of the efficacy of water to blood. This is a plain solution of the whole matter. God has transferred, in some way, the whitening efficacy, or cleansing power of water to blood ; and the absolving or pardoning power of blood to water. * * *

Yes ; as God first gave the efficacy of water to blood, he has now given the efficacy of blood to water. This, as was said, is figurative ; but it is not a figure that misleads, for the meaning is given without a figure, viz., immersion for the remission of sins. And to him that made the washing of clay from the eyes, the washing away of blindness, it is competent to make immersion of the body in water efficacious to the washing away of sin from the conscience. * * *

Thus immersion, says Peter, saves us, not by cleansing the body from its filth, but the conscience from its guilt ; yes, immersion saves us by burying us with Christ, raising us with him, and so our consciences are purified from dead

works to serve the living God. * * * The application of water, the cleansing element to the body is made in this gracious institution to reach the conscience, as did the blood of sprinkling under the law."

Hear Mr. Campbell again. He says, *Christianity Restored*, pp. 206 and 207, "To call the receiving of any spirit, or any influence, or energy, or any operations upon the heart of man, regeneration is an abuse of all speech, as well as a departure from the diction of the Holy Spirit, *who calls nothing personal regeneration except the act of immersion.*" (Mr. Campbell's emphasis.)

We have no fears but that the impartial reader will agree with us, that if Mr. Campbell does not teach baptismal salvation, then it is not in the power of the English language to teach it.

O. A. Burgess, one of the stars of Bethany, says: "If it now be asked what are the elements which make up a Scriptural answer to the question, 'What must I do to be saved,' this is the reply: 1st. Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. 2d. Repentance toward God. 3d. Immersion into the name of the Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit.

These, it will be shown, enter into each and every individual case; and that whenever the express mention of any one or more of these is omitted, that every omission will be found as proof that those elements have already entered into the occasion and accomplished their work." Living Pulpit, p. 173.

Robert Graham, a man of high repute among the Campbell Disciples, says of the candidate: "When such a one comes forth of the water in which he has been baptized into the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit according to the Saviour's command, the process of his regeneration is completed. He is saved by the washing of regeneration." Living Pulpit, p. 225.

W. H. Hopson, once a bright star in the school of Campbell, says: "The Savior in His wisdom and goodness—and all His acts are both wise and good—has seen fit to suspend the forgiveness of the sinner upon the three conditions, Faith, Repentance and Baptism. A full compliance is necessary to salvation, according to the statute governing the case."

Mr. Hopson also uses the following language as the conclusion of his reasoning on this point: "Baptism, then, is indispensably necessary to

salvation.” He then asks, “Will I be damned if I am not baptized?” and answers, “Certainly; why not?” Living Pulpit, pp. 288, 290 and 300.

The town of Bethamy, in West Virginia, was the headquarters of Campbellism. Here Mr. Campbell lived. And here he founded a college. Hence the word is sometimes used to indicate the doctrines advocated by Mr. Campbell. Mr. Jeter (Baptist), in his *Campbellism Examined*, said: “Regeneration means, in the Bethany dialect, born of water, or immersion.” In reply to this, Moses E. Lard (Campbellite), said, “Regeneration, in the *Bethany dialect*, is exactly equivalent to the new birth; and the new birth, in the Bethany dialect, means *to be begotten by the Spirit and to be born of water, or immersed*. But, because birth applies rather to the act of being born—the last act—than to any act preceding it, so in the the Bethany dialect regeneration applies rather to the act of being born of water—the last act—than to any act preceding it. But as birth, though applying rather to the last act than to any act preceding it includes nevertheless all the other acts which precede it, or the whole process of generation, so regeneration, though in the Bethany

dialect applying rather to the last act—the act of being born of water—than to any act preceding it, includes also all the other acts preceding it, or the whole process of being born again. In this sense, and in this only, and for these reasons, has Mr. Campbell ever employed the word ‘regeneration’ as equivalent to being born of water or immersion.” *Review of Campbellism Examined*, pp. 67, 68.

We have admitted this long quotation, as giving Campbellites the full benefit of an explanation of their doctrine of baptismal regeneration. And no man, be it remembered, was better qualified to make such explanation than was Mr. Lard. And, besides this, Lard’s *Review of Campbellism Examined*, containing this explanation, was written for Mr. Campbell, and at his request, as shown by Mr. Campbell’s introduction to the work. Then, according to Mr. Lard, with the full endorsement of Mr. Campbell, and in their Bethany dialect, immersion is the *last act* of regeneration. Therefore, when a Campbellite immerses a person, he performs for him the last act—the crowning act of his regeneration. Still, Campbellites deny that they teach baptismal regeneration, and yet they contend that a

man is not regenerated till he is baptized, and is regenerated in the act of baptism. In the name of common sense, what is this but baptismal regeneration?

Regeneration implies salvation. He that is regenerated is saved. If we are not regenerated till we are baptized, we are not saved till baptized. And this is what Campbellites contend for. Mr. Hopson, *Living Pulpit*, pp. 282, represents Protestants as asking the question: "Is baptism essential to salvation?" and answers: "We affirm that it is." And on page 290, *Living Pulpit*, he says: "Baptism, then, is indispensably necessary to salvation."

In the *Life and Times of Benjamin Franklin*, pp. 153, in speaking of the work of a Dr. R. T. Brown, in proselyting one Geo. Campbell, the authors say: "He then proceeded to show that in the divine economy, baptism with its proper antecedents, is designed to free us from our 'old sins.' " That is, in the minds of Joseph Franklin and J. A. Headington, the authors, representative men among the Campbellites, Dr. Brown shows that "baptism with its proper antecedents, is designed to free us from our 'old sins.' "

He that is freed from sins is saved, of course. So here is baptismal salvation again.

In a debate with S. M. Merrill, a Methodist preacher, in 1858, Benjamin Franklin, so long the editor of *American Christian Review*, affirmed that "The Scriptures teach that baptism is a condition of the forgiveness of sins." *Life and Times of Benjamin Franklin*, p. 487.

Dr. J. R. Lucas in the Ray-Lucas Debate, contended that baptism is for, in the sense of, in order to, the remission of sins.

The author has engaged in several discussions with these people, and in every one of them they have strenuously contended that men's sins are remitted, and that they are saved in the act of baptism. So in all the discussions between Baptists and Campbellites everywhere on the design of baptism, Campbellites have always contended for baptismal salvation as a most important doctrine.

Concerning the "Early Reformers," as the authors of the *Life and Times of Benjamin Franklin* are pleased to call them, we read on page 467: "Affirming that the sinner comes to the blood of Christ in baptism and remission of sins, they denied that it could be proven that the

sinner who is properly the subject of the gospel is pardoned without it."

H. T. Anderson, a man of renown and a scholar, a man whom we admire except that he belonged to the Campbellites, said: "The Disciples baptize men to make them Christians." Ray-Lucas Debate, p. 101.

And yet many of these people deny that they teach baptismal regeneration, because they say they don't teach that baptism is all of regeneration; but that it is only the completing act of regeneration. We refer the reader to Mr. Lard's explanation, also to that of Simpson Ely, in this chapter, and to these we will add the words of Mr. Campbell: "We do not believe in baptismal regeneration, because we do not believe that baptism will make one hair white or black without faith and repentance, unless the heart is turned to God." Campbell-Rice Debate, p. 544. Quoted in Gospel in Water, p. 291.

But we have never heard of any one charging that Campbellites teach that the sinner is regenerated in baptism without the exercise of the perverted Campbellite faith and repentance, which, by consulting chapters eleven and twelve

of this book, the reader will see are not the repentance and faith of God's elect.

A chief point in the teaching of Campbellism is the doctrine of baptismal salvation. Much of their boasting is here. To read their reports of victories over their opponents, one would be led to believe that these Campbellite Samsons had completely broken down, run over, vanquished and smitten with dismay every foe to this dogma. But such is not the case, for we have seen with our own eyes several of these boasted warriors who were well enough satisfied not to meet their Baptist opponents on the field of controversy any more, on this and other subjects.

Still it may serve their purpose to make a show of bravery, and to impress the multitude, as far as they can, that they are themselves masters of the field, and more than conquerors. We distinctly remember more than one instance in which Campbellites have been silenced in controversy; and, notwithstanding, have reported great victories for themselves.

And yet, after all, their insisting on remission, regeneration and salvation in the waters of baptism, and their boasted victories in the conflict, they tell us that they do not teach baptismal re-

generation. And all, because they say they teach that something else is required by them in the process of regeneration before it is completed in the act of baptism. They claim that in order to contend for baptismal regeneration they would have to contend that baptism is all of regeneration, with no faith, no repentance and no preparation before.

But this would exonerate the Roman Catholics from teaching baptismal regeneration, because they teach the necessity of something they call faith and repentance in case of adults before baptism, in preparation for the ordinance. In Perry's (Catholic) Instruction, page 272, on the subject of preparation for baptism, we read: "Children, of course, can make no preparation, nor is any required of them; but they who have come to the use of reason before they are baptized, must get instruction in the doctrines of the Church, and must believe them. 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned.' 'Go ye, therefore, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' They must also have true repentance, and resolve to lead a Christian life: '*Do*

penance, and be baptized every one of you,
* * * for the remission of your sins.' ”

In a work “ By the Most Rev. Dr. Challoner,” entitled “ The Catholic Christian Instructed,” on page 36, we have a question and answer, as follows :

“ Q. What are the effects of the sacrament of baptism ?

A. First, it washes away original sin, in which are all born, by reason of the sin of our first father, Adam. Secondly, it remits all actual sins which we ourselves have committed [in case we have committed any before baptism] both as to the guilt and pain. Thirdly, it infuses the habit of divine grace into our souls, and makes us the adopted children of God. Fourthly, it gives us a right and title to the Kingdom of Heaven. Fifthly, it imprints a character or spiritual mark in the soul. Sixthly, in fine, it lets us into the Church of God, and makes us children and members of the Church.’ ”

And in the same work, page 37, occurs the following questions and answers :

“ Q. From whence has baptism the power of conferring grace and washing away our sins ?

A. From the institution of Christ and in vir-

tue of His blood, passion and death. From whence also all the other sacraments have their efficacy. For there is no obtaining mercy, grace or salvation but through the passion of Jesus Christ.

Q. In what manner must a person, that is come to years of discretion, prepare himself for the sacrament of baptism?

A. By faith and repentance: and, therefore, it is necessary that he be first well instructed in the Christian doctrine, and that he firmly believe all the articles of the Catholic Faith. Secondly, that he be heartily sorry for all his sins, firmly resolving to lead a good Christian life, to renounce all sinful habits, and to make full satisfaction to all whom he has any ways injured.”

Do the foregoing citations of Popish authorities teach the doctrine of baptismal salvation any more positively than do the Campbellites?

Reader, if you will turn and read again the citations of Campbellite authorities in the preceding part of this chapter, you will say the Catholics do not exceed the Campbellites in positiveness on this point. We fear not that you will decide that language itself is incapable of expressing the idea of baptismal salvation, if Camp-

bellites do not teach it. But to make assurance doubly sure, we here add one or two more Campbellite authorities:

Alexander Campbell says in *Christianity Restored*, page 247: "And will that Son, who, for no other purpose than to honor His Father's institution, was immersed in the Jordan, bestow pardon or salvation upon any who refuse to honor Him, and Him that sent Him? He has been graciously pleased to adopt means to ends. He has commanded immersion for the remission of sins; and, think you that He will change His institution because of your stubborn or intractible disposition? As well as reasonably might you pray for loaves from Heaven, or manna, because Israel eat it in the desert, as to pray for pardon while you refuse the remission of your sins by immersion."

And remember, Mr. W. H. Hopson, a chief man among these Disciples, has said: "Baptism, then, is indispensably necessary to salvation." *Living Pulpit*, page 290.

We have given you sufficient proof that the Campbellites teach the Popish doctrine of baptismal salvation. If we have not, then there is no such Popish doctrine, for they teach it just like

the Popish priests and doctors teach it, except that one is Campbellite faith and repentance, connected with baptism for salvation; and the other is Catholic faith and repentance, connected with baptism for salvation. Of course, the action which they practice for baptism is different, but the doctrine is the same.

And, when you Campbellites say that baptism gets its efficacy from the merits and blood of Jesus, the Popish priests say the same. If you say your administrator does not perform the saving act in baptism, the Romish priest will also say the same. The Catholic will say that God performs the saving act, as quick as the Campbellite, if not a little quicker. But both say they are saved in the act of baptism, and *this is baptismal salvation*.

So, away with the Campbellite denial of baptismal salvation! It is only a convenient dodge to deceive good, unsuspecting people who do not believe this Popish dogma, in order to get them into the Campbellite Church, and gain the benefit of their influence and support in building up Campbellism. So let it be remembered that he who preaches salvation in the waters of baptism inevitably teaches the Popish doctrine of baptismal salvation.

CHAPTER VII.

THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISMAL SALVATION REFUTED.

First. We oppose to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration the fact that its Campbellite advocates deny teaching it. They are constantly asserting the doctrine; and almost as constantly seeking to make the impression that they do not teach it. This, the reader will see by consulting the last several chapters of this book. Their double dealing on this subject forces us to one or two conclusions. Either they are conscious of the falsity of the doctrine, or conscientiously believing it, they are wanting in the necessary moral courage for a consistent, honest advocacy of it. If the first, they knowingly teach that which is false. If the second, it is evident that they are not "of the stuff that martyrs are made of." He who conscientiously advocates a doctrine *will not deny it*.

Secondly. We oppose to the doctrine the fact that its support depends upon a manifest perversion of the Word of God. One of the passages

mainly relied upon for the support of this doctrine is Acts 2:38: "Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Campbellites understand that the verbs "repent and be baptized" in this passage are united to obtain one result—the remission of sins.

A. P. Williams says of the passage: "Peter does not make repentance and baptism sustain the same relationship to the remission of sins. The word repent is independent of the remainder of the sentence. It is not 'Every one of you repent and be baptized,' etc. The nominative to 'repent' is not 'every one,' but 'ye.' The Greek is *metanoesate*; an imperative in the plural. It can not, therefore, have a singular nominative. The word rendered be baptized is *baptistheto*. While it is a mild imperative it is not plural. 'Every one' is its nominative. Hence the literal and correct translation would be: Repent ye, and let every one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins.' 'For remission of sins,' then, whatever may be its meaning, is stated as a reason for the latter command and not for the former. The command to repent is

given imperatively without a reason—repent ye. There was reason enough for this found in their conscious guilt and consequent alarm. But the reason why they should be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ is not so apparent, hence a reason is given: ‘For the remission of sins.’”

This rendering of Mr. Williams is sustained by the facts in the case, as well as by the translation of the passage by Mr. Campbell, which reads as follows: “Reform, and be each of you immersed in the name of Jesus Christ,” etc. See Campbell’s version: “The Living oracles.” This should be good authority with the Campbellites. Let no one of them, after this, presume to say that the verbs repent and be baptized are united to obtain the same result. Their oracle is against them. The whole multitude were commanded to repent, because they were sinners; but only the penitent believers were commanded to be baptized. This is the reason for the change of nominatives, and also of the change of the number and person of the verbs. The believers were commanded to “be baptized for the remission of sins.”

The Campbellite interpretation of this passage proceeds upon the supposition that “for” necessarily means “in order to.” But does the word “for”

necessarily mean "in order to"? We think not. Let us use an illustration. We hear it said that A was sent to penitentiary for stealing a horse. Will you necessarily understand that A was sent to penitentiary in order that he might steal a horse? No. If it is said that B was hung for killing a man, will we have to understand that B was hung in order to his killing a man? Oh no, not necessarily. Then when Peter says: "Be baptized. * * * for the remission of sins," do we necessarily understand that we must be baptized in order to the remission of sins? Certainly not. Then you ask, is there anything in the Scripture use of the word "for" which establishes "in order to," as its essential meaning?" We answer, there is nothing. But we will show you a passage in which it is demonstrated that the word, "for" does not necessarily mean in order to. Turn to Mark, first chapter, 40th to 44th verses, and read:

"And there came a leper to him, beseeching him, and kneeling down to him, and saying unto him, If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean.

And Jesus, moved with compassion, put forth *his* hand, and touched him, and saith unto him, I will; be thou clean.

And as soon as he had spoken, immediately the leprosy departed from him, and he was cleansed.

And he straitly charged him, and forthwith sent him away;

And saith unto him, See thou say nothing to any man: but go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing those things which Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them."

Here it is declared that as soon as Jesus spoke the words to the leper, "Be thou clean," immediately the leprosy departed from him, and he was cleansed." Then Jesus said to this cleansed leper: "Go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing those things which Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them."

After he was cleansed, he was commanded to offer for his cleansing. This cannot mean that he was to offer in order to his cleansing. But Christ said: "Offer for thy cleansing, * * * for a testimony unto them." But a testimony unto whom? and a testimony of what? Why, a testimony to the people, of course. And a testimony to the fact that he was cleansed. Yes, already cleansed. By reference to the 14th chap-

ter of Leviticus, the reader will see that the leper who was already healed of his disease, was required by the law to show evidence to the priest that he was healed or cleansed from his leprosy. Then, after having been pronounced clean, or well from the disease, he was required to make an offering for his cleansing. This offering was a testimony to the people that he was already cleansed. So they needed no longer fear to receive him into society. So when one is cleansed from his sins in the blood of Christ, it is evidently proper that he should make an offering of himself to God in the waters of baptism, which though they cannot literally cleanse from sin, they can be used for a testimony to the people of his cleansing. As the offering and the washing of the cleansed leper were declarative of his cleansing, so the offering and washing of the candidate in baptism are declarative of his cleansing in the all-efficient blood of Jesus. He can now be welcomed to the society of God's people and to the Church of the living God.

The Greek words that are rendered "for the remission of sins" in Acts 2 : 38, are *eis aphesin amartion*. And every Campbellite is willing to risk his salvation upon their meaning in order to

the remission of sins. And why? Because Campbell and the teachers of his doctrine have so translated and interpreted these words. But in Mat. 3:11, in the words rendered by King James' translators, "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance," the Greek words rendered unto repentance, are *eis metanoian*, and are rarely ever rendered by a Campbellite, "in order to repentance." And why? Because though Mr. Campbell and the teachers of his doctrine contend that baptism precedes remission, they also hold that repentance precedes baptism. But if *eis aphesin* should be rendered, in order to remission, then *eis metanoian* should be rendered in order to repentance. Most assuredly. For the construction is the same.

Campbellites hold that repentance is nothing but reformation. Hence Mr. Campbell renders the first clause of Mat. 3:11, "I indeed immerse you in water into reformation." And Mr. Campbell certainly understood "immerse you into reformation" to mean, because of reformation. For he has John to say to the Pharisees and Sadducees who demanded baptism of him, "Offspring of vipers, who has prompted you to flee from the impending vengeance? Produce then

the proper fruit of reformation,” Living Oracles, Mat. 3:7, 8. If John demanded “the proper fruit” of repentance before baptism, then repentance precedes baptism, of course. And if John baptized *eis metanoian* into repentance in the sense of because of repentance, how is it that Peter did not command the Pentecostians to be baptized *eis aphasin* into remission in the sense of because of remission? Answer this, ye followers of Campbell.

We insert here a pertinent letter from Elder J. G. Swinney, of Woodlawn, Mo.

SEPT. 4th, 1887.

“BRO. RAY: By your request, I send you the thoughts expressed at the close of Bro. Stark’s sermon. I said that some people held the idea that baptism bore precisely the same relation to salvation that repentance and faith did. This I did not believe, from the following reasons:

1st. To be alike essential, they all must have their origin at the same time, etc.

2d. They must be enjoined by the same law. But this was not the case. Repentance and faith were enjoined by moral, but baptism by positive law.

3d. They were dependent upon different agencies: the one divine, the other human.

4th. Their effects are different. Repentance and faith affect the inner man. Baptism the outer man.

5th. Their subjects are different. All grades of sinners are commanded to repent and believe or perish, because they are such. But they are not commanded to be baptized because they are such, but rather because of repentance towards God and faith in Christ.

6th. Contingencies might arise in the one case, to prevent the one which never could arise to prevent the other. As to baptism, many contingencies might arise; such as the unwillingness of the administrator, the want of a sufficiency of water, sickness, imprisonment, etc. But in the other case, if a man has the moral disposition to repent and believe, he would do it in spite of all the combined powers of earth and hell.

7th. As no one can be saved without repentance and faith, if baptism is alike essential to salvation, no one can be saved without it, no difference what may be the hindering cause.

You observe, Brother Ray, that I have only

given you the heads of my remarks. If for private use or otherwise, you can fill out.

Yours truly,

JNO. G. SWINNEY,
Woodlawn, Mo."

CHAPTER VIII.

BAPTISMAL SALVATION REFUTED—CONTINUED.

Acts 22:16: "And why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." This passage is regarded by Campbellites as a strong support of the doctrine of baptismal remission. And we agree that sins are washed away, in some sense, in the waters of baptism. But in what sense? Shall we understand that when Ananias said to Saul, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins," that he meant that Saul's sins would exude and become like dust on his body, so that one dip in water would wash them all away? Or shall we conclude with Mr. Campbell, that there is "A transferring of the efficacy of blood to water?" So that the waters of baptism penetrate in the recess of the soul, and wash away its sins? If we say, with Mr. Campbell and his Disciples, that the efficacy of Christ's blood is transferred to the waters of baptism, how shall we escape the conclusion that the efficacy of His

blood is likewise transferred to the Lord's Supper? And is this the secret of Campbellite weekly observance of the communion, that is, to keep themselves in a saved condition?

Campbellites contend that the passage under consideration furnishes good authority for saying that our sins are actually washed away in baptism. If so, we say that the words of our Savior, "This is my body," and "This is my blood," furnish us with good authority for saying that the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper are the body and blood of the Lord. If it is a sin, as Campbellites contend, to say that the passage under review, does not mean exactly what it says; then how is it any less a sin to say that the words of Jesus, as quoted above, do not mean exactly what they say? Yet Campbellites dare say, that the words, "this is," in connection with the Lord's Supper, are equivolent to saying, this represents. So that when Christ said, "this is my body," and "this is my blood," it is to be understood as equivolent to saying, this represents my body, and this represents my blood. So, with the same authority, we may understand the words of Ananias: "Be baptized and wash away thy sins," as equivolent to saying, be baptized, and repre-

sent the washing away of thy sins, for the same Bible that says wash away your sins in baptism, also says the bread and wine of the eucharist are the body and blood of Christ. And if it is lawful to say that the bread and wine are not really Christ's body and blood, but that they represent His body and blood, it is also lawful to say that baptism does not really wash away sins, but that it represents the washing away of sins; and this is what we maintain.

Campbellites will agree with us that there are but two gospel ordinances, baptism and the Lord's Supper, and the Supper represents Christ's body and blood. But if the Supper represents the body and blood of Christ, why should not baptism represent the washing away of sins? For surely it is lawful to consider baptism as representative in its character as it is to consider the Lord's Supper representative in its character.

J. B. Jeter who wrote "Campbellism Examined," was a Baptist, and of course, contended for the actual remission of sins upon the exercise of faith, and before baptism. In reply to this position of his, Mr. Lard (Campbellite) used the following language: "But let us suppose his [Jeter's] theory of remission to be correct.

Paul's sins, then, were remitted the instant in which he believed, and consequently before his baptism. At that time, therefore, his sins had no existence whatever. They were simply a nonentity. Indeed, he had *no sins*, hence none to be remitted, none to be washed away, none to be disposed of in any sense. And yet Ananias, the Lord's special messenger, is represented as saying to him: 'Arise, and be baptized, and *wash away thy sins!*' Did Ananias, we ask in the name of truth, command Paul to be baptized and wash away his *sins*, when absolutely he had not one sin remaining? If the theory of Mr. Jeter is correct, it casts over the deed of Ananias a painful suspicion; but if the language of Ananias is true, it brands the theory of Mr. Jeter as a human invention, and false." Lard's Review of Campbellism Examined, p. 206.

To this A. P. Williams replies as follows: "In order to expose this sophistry, let me apply it to the case of the leper, cited from Mark 1st chapter. But let us suppose his [Williams'] theory of the cleansing of the leper to be correct. This leper's leprosy, then, was cleansed the instant in which Christ said unto him: 'Be thou clean,' consequently before he offered for his cleansing. At

that time, therefore, his leprosy had no existence whatever. It was simply a nonentity. Indeed, he had *no leprosy*, hence none to be cleansed from, none to be washed away, none to be disposed of in any sense. And yet Jesus, the Lord's own Son, is represented as saying to him: 'Go, offer for thy cleansing!' Did Jesus, we ask in the name of truth, command this leper to offer for his *cleansing* when absolutely he had not the least taint of leprosy remaining? If the theory of Mr. Williams be correct, it casts over the deed of Jesus a painful suspicion; but if the language of Jesus be true, it brands the theory of Mr. Williams as a human invention, and false."

The analogy is complete, and shows the utter fallacy of the Campbellite position.

Mr. Williams remarks again: "Mr. Lard admits that *apolouşai* [wash away] is *middle*, and, hence, represents Paul as being commanded to *separate himself from his sins*. Yet, this he denies. Sins, he acknowledges, are remitted as an act of mercy by our Heavenly Father. Then, does it not follow as a necessary conclusion, '*wash away thy sins*' cannot mean remission of sins? But this Mr. Lard saw he must make it mean, or it would not sustain his proposition.

According to Mr. Lard's own showing, 'wash away thy sins' cannot mean remission, yet he makes it mean that, and builds his argument upon it accordingly. Is not that sophistry?"

Washing was used as a symbol of innocence, or purity, in the times of the Apostles, as the following passage will show: "When Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing, but *that* rather a tumult was made, he took water, and washed *his* hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just person; see ye *to it*." Matt. 27:24. He whose sins are remitted, is innocent before God. He is innocent because of this remission. Therefore, it is becoming in him to represent this most important event, by the washing away of his sins in baptism. Remission of sins is the act of God. The washing of them away in baptism, is the act of man, and is a figure of what the Lord has done for the believer. Hence, we read: "The like figure whereunto *even* baptism doth also now save us [not the putting away of filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,] by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." But the figurative cleansing, is not the real cleansing, but only the likeness, or the picture of it; and it

is certain that the figure, or likeness of a thing, cannot be produced before the thing exists, of which it is a likeness; and as baptism is a figure of salvation, the salvation must exist before baptism.

“He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.” The above passage is relied upon as a strong support of the doctrine of baptismal salvation by Campbellites and Catholics, and all the advocates of the doctrine. Mr. Lard in his *Review of Campbellism Examined*, p. 183, says of this passage: “That the salvation here spoken of is that primary salvation which consists in the remission of sins, we hold to be simply certain.” But how could Mr. Lard be “Simply certain” that the salvation here referred to is the primary salvation of which he speaks? “Shall be saved,” in the text, is certainly the antithesis of “Shall be damned.” A. P. Williams, in his reply to this position of Mr. Lard’s, uses the following language: “The Bible knows nothing of these primary and secondary salvations; and even if it did, we would be required to take the term here in its secondary sense, because it is used antithetically with ‘Shall be damned.’ ‘He that be-

lieveth and is baptized *shall be saved*,' "but" 'he that believeth not, *shall be damned*.' "Antitheses run parallel with each other, and they must be co-extensive. Now, whatever is the meaning and extent of 'Shall be damned,' the term 'Shall be saved,' must be of equal extent. There is a sense in which an unbeliever is condemned already, [John 3:18.] And so there is a sense in which he that believeth is not condemned, [same verse] but the text we are now considering speaks not of the *present*, but of the *future*—'Shall be saved,' 'Shall be damned.' The term 'Shall be damned' is expressive of the final issue or result of unbelief, and, therefore, 'Shall be saved' is expressive of the final issue or result of faith and obedience."

He who pretends to believe, and refuses to be baptized, cannot be saved. "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me." Jno. 14:21. "He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." 1 Jno. 2:4. But such a one is condemned, not for the want of baptism, but for the want of faith. It is significant that immediately after the expression: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved,"

occur the words, "But he that believeth not shall be damned." But never, in all the Bible, does such an expression occur, as he that is baptized not shall be damned: no, never! But it is very remarkable how often such expressions as the following occur in the Bible: "O Lord of hosts, blessed is the man that trusteth in Thee." Ps. 84:12. And "Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish *from* the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed *are* all they that put their trust in him." Ps. 2:12. Here it is declared that all they that put their trust in the Son of God are blessed. And when we come into the New Testament, the light of Revelation is luminous upon the fact that "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." Jno. 3:36. This is not a promise concerning the future like "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved;" but it is a promise of present blessing to the believer. As "He that believeth on the Son hath [has] everlasting life," and we believe before we are baptized, therefore, we *have everlasting life* before we are baptized. In John 5:24, our Savior said: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life,

and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life.” A literal rendering of the original of the words “From death unto life,” would read: *out of death into life*. Mr. Campbell’s rendering of the passage, in the “Living Oracles,” is a slam against his doctrine. He renders it in the following words: “Most assuredly, I say to you, he who hears my doctrine, and believes him who sent me, has eternal life, and shall not suffer condemnation, having passed from death to life.” Campbellites say that the sinner has not passed from death to life, when he believes. They also say that a man may come into condemnation after he has passed from death to life. But you see the Word of God is against them.

“Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” Jno. 3:5. This text is also used by Campbellites in trying to establish their doctrine of baptismal salvation. True, they say it was spoken by our Savior before the gospel dispensation commenced; and, therefore, before there was any gospel, any kingdom or any Christian baptism. Everything that is Christian must have its beginning on the

day of Pentecost, in the mind of a Campbellite. Yet, this passage, spoken about three years before Pentecost, must be pressed into the support of this cherished doctrine. Hence the Campbellite says: "The passage was intended, when spoken, to have, not a present, but a prospective bearing." Two facts are sufficient to convince the impartial reader of the untruthfulness of this statement. First, Christ used the present tense. In the second place, the text was spoken to Nicodemus, a man then present before the Savior, and seeking for light. It is preposterous to suppose that Christ would give to him instruction which, in the nature of the case, would be impracticable for three long years.

Campbellites understand that the phrase "born of water" means baptism. And yet they hold that there was no Christian baptism at the time. But if there was no baptism, there was no baptismal salvation. That is certain. And we have shown that these words were used to administer present instruction. If Christ had meant baptism, He, doubtless, would have said so. The word "born" does not mean baptism; the word "water" does not. There is nothing in the words themselves, or in the relation which they sustain

to each other, that would force us to the conclusion that baptism is meant. The interpretation that makes "born of water" mean baptism, is nothing but a relic of Romanism.

When Nicodemus said: "How can these things be?" Jesus replied: "Art thou a master of Israel and knowest not these things?" This reply contained a reproof to Nicodemus as a teacher of Israel, for not understanding the things of which Christ had been speaking. But as a teacher of Israel, Nicodemus could have known nothing of Christian baptism, for he had recourse only to the Old Testament Scriptures, and they say nothing of baptism. Therefore, the words "born of water" do not mean baptism.

Campbellites understand that the whole process of the new birth is comprehended in the act of baptism. That by one immersion, we are born both of the water and of the Spirit. That the Spirit is the Father, and the water the Mother of us all. That we are previously begotten of the Spirit. And that when we are baptized we are born of the Spirit, just as a child is born of its father when it born of its mother. But this is not according to the truth of God, for Christ says: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and

thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth ; so is every one that is born of the Spirit." Christ here illustrates the new birth by the blowing of wind. But there is no resemblance between the blowing of wind and water baptism. Therefore, water baptism cannot be the new birth.

We submit the following explanation of the expression, "born of water and of the Spirit." When a man is saved there is a two-fold work done for him. He is washed from his sins and renewed in the Spirit of his mind. David's prayer for mercy in the 51st Psalm includes both ideas: "Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow." "Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me." We have a parallel passage to our text in Titus 3:5, 6: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; "Which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour."

Here is both the washing and the renewing of the Holy Ghost. This two-fold work is "Of the Holy Ghost," because performed by the Holy

Spirit. And this "Is shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ." That is to say, these incomparable blessings come upon us through Jesus Christ as our mediator. And they are the work of the Almighty. Campbellites agree with us that this passage is parallel to John 3:5; but they also claim that it teaches baptismal salvation. But it would be intensely absurd to say that baptism was "Shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior." Then, again, this text tells us what we are not saved by, as well as what we are saved by. It declares that we are not saved by works of righteousness which we have done. But baptism is a work of righteousness which we have done. Therefore we are not saved by baptism.

CHAPTER IX.

BAPTISMAL SALVATION REFUTED. (CONCLUDED.)

“Wherein (the ark) few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God), by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.” 1 Pet. 3: 20, 21.

A perversion of this passage is much relied upon by Campbellites in support of baptismal salvation. Moses E. Lard, a great Campbellite leader, quotes it as follows: “‘Wherein (the ark) few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us—not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God.’”

In this quotation Mr. Lard leaves out the parenthesis there is in the passage and the words, “By the resurrection of Jesus Christ,” which is an important part of the passage itself. By so mutilating it, the passage would better appear to

support his doctrine of baptismal salvation. But after mutilating the passage, as above, still Mr. Lard was not satisfied with it. Hear him. He says: "This passage (so exceedingly obscure in the form here cited), is susceptible of a much more intelligible rendering, thus: In which (ark) a few, that is eight, souls were saved by water, which also now saves us in its antitype, baptism, which consists not in putting away fleshly impurity, but in seeking a good conscience in God." See Lard's Review of Campbellism Examined, p. 214.

In reply to this, A. P. Williams says: "Now, reader, you can see what havoc has been done to the text by Mr. Lard. Peter tells us baptism saves us *by the resurrection of Jesus Christ*. This you will see by reading the passage without the parenthesis. But Mr. Lard makes him say baptism saves us; or rather the water in baptism saves, without telling us how. He makes him omit this and give us in lieu of it that in which baptism consists. Never was a text more tortured. I think it will be a martyr before it will testify for Mr. Lard."

Here we feel constrained to step aside and let Bro. Williams explain this passage. He says:

“1. In explaining this passage, the first thing I notice is, that it contains an *analogy*. Noah and his family were saved in the ark by water; and as the ark saved them *by* water, so baptism saves us *by* the resurrection of Jesus Christ. This is the analogy.”

“2. Noah’s salvation in the ark was a figure or type, therefore called a ‘like figure.’

These two facts are the key to lead us into the passage. But perhaps I had better *prove* the above statements before I proceed. Was Noah’s salvation in the ark a figure? It certainly was or it could not have any other figure to resemble it. A figure cannot be like that which is no figure. Hence the term ‘like figure’ (*antitupon*). Well, is baptism a figure? It must be, or it would not be *like* the other figure. The Greek word used here implies two figures alike in their signification. It is not faithfully translated by our word *antitype*. This word signifies not the type, but that which is typified. This the Greek word does not signify. It is used in another place; let us go to that, and we will get some light. Hebrews 9:24: ‘For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true.’ The Greek here is the same. Now,

every one can see that here the word cannot have the sense of 'antitype.' For surely no one can suppose that the holy places made with hands are the antitype of heaven! No; the idea, I take it, is this: God gave Moses the pattern of these holy places in the Mount, and he made these holy places *like* them. Now, these were the pattern of the heavenly things. So were those. They were, then, 'like figures,' *i. e.*, figures of the same things. 'Like figure,' then, is a good translation; antitype is not. Let us now proceed to enquire of what Noah's salvation in the ark is a figure? It is a figure of the *resurrection* of Jesus Christ and salvation through him. Paul says: 'By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; by the which he condemned the world and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith.' Heb. 9:7. We all know what this salvation is. We know what lies at its foundation, to-wit: the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Noah's faith looked through his temporal salvation in the ark to that spiritual salvation by faith in the blood of him who was delivered for our offenses, and raised again for our justification."

“Here, then, you see that of which Noah’s salvation was typical. Well, baptism is typical of the same thing. Need I prove this? We need no other passage than the one found in Rom. 6:3-5: ‘Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? ‘Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also *in the likeness* of *his* resurrection.’

The word rendered “likeness” here means image or similitude. See the following examples: Romans 1:23: ‘Into an image made like to corruptible man,’ etc., Rom. 5:14: ‘After the similitude of Adam’s transgression,’ etc., Rom. 8:3: ‘God sending his own Son in the *likeness* of sinful flesh,’ etc., Phil. 2:7: ‘Was made in the likeness of men.’ ”

“Our descent into the waters of baptism implies our previous death to sin, so Christ’s descent into the grave implied his previous death for sin; therefore the former is in the likeness of the latter.

“Our rising again from the waters of baptism to walk in newness of life, is like our Savior rising from the grave to live unto God. Now, then, we are prepared to understand Peter. Let me again quote the text, leaving out the parenthesis: ‘When once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah while the ark was preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. As Noah’s entrance into the ark out of the old world typified Christ’s passage out of this world into the grave, and as Noah’s emergence from the ark into the new world typified Christ’s emergence from the tomb to die no more, it presented to his mind the righteousness which is by faith, and he embraced.’”

“And so baptism, in its figurative significancy, presenting the same things to our faith contributes to our salvation. It saved us by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, i. e., it is a striking figure of our salvation by his resurrection.”

“The resurrection of Jesus Christ is so fundamental that everything else without it is nugatory and vain. ‘If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain, our preaching is also vain, and ye are yet

in your sins.' Yea, more even, 'they who have fallen asleep in Christ are perished.' We cannot have the faith which saves unless we believe in our hearts that God has raised Jesus from the dead. And whoever looks on the ordinance of baptism sees an imperishable symbolic monument of this great truth. I cannot see the mystery of which some men speak in this passage from Peter.' "

"But how about the parenthesis? Well, it sheds light on the subject. A parenthesis is generally used for this purpose. As Peter had said baptism saved us, he thought it proper to explain. It saves, he tells us, not because it is a putting away the filth of the flesh, but because it is the answer of a good conscience toward God. The 'filth of the flesh' here refers to ceremonial defilements. Peter was writing to Jewish Christians (strangers scattered about, 1 Peter 1,) persons, therefore, who was accustomed to such defilements, and who laid considerable stress upon them as prejudicial to their salvation; hence, as baptism was, like their bathings under the law, an immersion in water, they were liable to mistake it as a ceremonial purification—a putting away of the filth of the flesh; but Peter tells them it is

not that, but it is the answer of a good conscience toward God."

"The word rendered 'answer,' Mr. Lard renders 'seeking.' For this rendering I have seen but one authority. That authority is *Alexander Campbell*! If baptism is the seeking of a good conscience, what kind of a conscience does the subject have before he is baptized? I read in the Bible of a seared conscience (1 Tim. 4:2,) and a defiled conscience (Titus 1:15), and an evil conscience (Heb. 10:22); and a good conscience (1 Tim. 1:5.) Now, if the candidate for baptism has not this good conscience when he applies for the ordinance, what kind of a conscience has he? It is evident, that, according to Mr. Lard, he has not a *good* conscience, or he would not come *seeking* one."

"Suppose Mr. Lard, like Mr. Campbell, thinks: 'And to him that made the washing of clay from the eyes, the washing away of blindness, it is competent to make the immersion of the body in water efficacious to the washing away of sin *from the conscience*. And thus he makes Peter to say: 'Immersion saves us, not by cleansing the body from its filth, but the conscience from its guilt.' Christianity Restored, p. 221. But Peter never

said such a thing in all his life. According to Mr. Lard and Mr. Campbell, Peter's parenthesis ought to read: 'Not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the putting away filth from the conscience.' But Peter has not said this, and had he said it, he would have contradicted Paul; for Paul tells us the *blood of Christ*, not baptism, purges the conscience from dead works.' " Campbellism Exposed, pp. 322 to 326.

The ordinance of baptism, as the Scriptures teach it, is a most beautiful and significant figure. It speaks of the death of Christ for sin, and of the believer's death to sin. In a figure, the believer is baptized into Christ. When he is buried in baptism, he is buried with Christ; when he is raised up from the waters of baptism, he is raised up with Christ; and that, too, to walk in a newness of life, in which, also, his future resurrection is beautifully shadowed forth. In the 6th chapter of Romans, and 1st to the 7th verses, inclusive, we read:

" What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were bap-

tized into his death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall be also *in the likeness* of *His* resurrection: Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with *Him*, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin."

The apostle was laboring to show that believers in Christ should not continue in sin, and this he argues from the fact that they had professed to be dead to sin, in that they had been buried with Christ by baptism. As Christ died for sin before He was buried, so these Roman Christians had died to sin before they were buried in baptism. But the 7th verse says: "He that is dead is freed from sin." They were dead to sin before they were buried in baptism. Therefore, they were freed from sin before they were baptized, Campbellism to the contrary, notwithstanding.

Christ was crucified. This was no easy death. So were these ancient Christians crucified to the

world.* In the 6th verse we read: "That our old man is crucified with Him." This is a crucifixion of the old depraved nature. And it is not so easy a thing as to answer affirmatively, the question: "Do you believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God," and to have a Campbellite preacher drawl over the words: "Thank God for the good confession." Crucifixion implies suffering, and this is required of the sinner.

The Christians were baptized into Christ. But at the same time that they were baptized into Christ, they were also baptized into His death. And we know a baptism in water is not an actual participation in Christ's death on the cross. In the 5th verse we read: "If we have been planted together in the likeness of His death." Baptism, then, is a likeness of death; and nothing looks more like death than the burial of the corpse.

* In James 4:8-10, we read: "Cleanse your hands, ye sinners; and purify your hearts, ye double-minded. Be afflicted, and mourn, and weep: let your laughter be turned to mourning, and your joy to heaviness. Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and He shall lift you up." And as this affliction, or crucifixion and death of the "old man" was experienced before their baptism, so we also should have an experience comparable to a death by the cross, before we are baptized. And as the Campbellites profess no such experience before their baptism, theirs is not a Scriptural profession of religion.

So when the believer is buried with Christ in baptism, he declares that he is dead to sin. It would be an outrage to bury people alive. Yet Campbellites propose to bury sinners (men who are alive to sin), in baptism, in order to kill them to sin.

As the baptism into Christ's death was not a real participation in His death, but a profession of having received the benefits of His death, so the baptism into Christ was not the real putting of the person baptized into Christ, but what in another figure is called putting on Christ. In Gal. 3:26, 27, we read: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Should you see a child putting on its clothing, it were silly in you to imagine that the child had made itself in the act of putting on its garments. As children must be born into this world before the putting on of their clothing, so we must be the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus before we put Him on in baptism.

As our "old man" was crucified with Christ before we were buried with Him by baptism, so we were raised up with Him, to a new life, a

profession of which we made in our rising up from the waters of baptism. And this is a pledge also that He will raise up these vile bodies in the resurrection of the last day, and transform them into a likeness to His own glorious body.

The whole doctrine, which we have drawn from Rom. 6:1-7, is set forth in a parallel passage. In Collossians, 2d chapter, 10th to the 13th verses. We read as follows:

“And ye are complete in Him, which is the head of all principality and power: In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: Buried with Him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with *Him* through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead. And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath He quickened together with Him, having forgiven you all trespasses.”

The circumcision here mentioned is the circumcision of which the apostle speaks in Rom. 2:28, 29: “For he is not a Jew, which is not one outwardly; neither *is that* circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: But he *is* a Jew, which is

one inwardly; and circumcision *is that* of the heart, in the spirit, *and* not in the letter; whose praise *is* not of men, but of God."

This circumcision of the heart, Paul says: "Is made without hands." This peculiar expression is used by the apostle to signify the work of God, who needs not to employ the use of hands; but who, by the exercise of His sovereign will brings His almighty power to bear in circumcising the heart, and in making a Jew inwardly. This implies the remission of sins. The Colossians were "Circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh," before they were buried with Christ in baptism, and this proves the remission of sins before baptism. For in this circumcision made without hands, they are represented as having put "off the body of the sins of the flesh," which is equivalent to saying that they had put off the corrupt mass of the sins of their unrenewed nature, before they were baptized. Then they were buried with Christ in baptism, wherein also they were risen with Him, "through the faith of operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead." But if you Campbellites insist that we are literally baptized into Jesus

Christ, because we read "were baptized into Jesus Christ," then with the same plausibility we might say that we are literally baptized into repentance. Because we have in Matt. 3: 11, in the original, *Ego men baptidzo humas en hudati eis metanoian*. (I indeed, immerse you in water into repentance.) If into Jesus Christ is a good translation of *eis Christon Iesoun*, why is not into repentance a good translation of *eis metanoian*? Here *eis* sustains the same relation to *metanoian*, the word for repentance, that it does to *Christon Iesoun*, the words for Jesus Christ. We do not say that we would translate *eis* *by into* in either passage, but it does appear to us that it would be as appropriate to translate it *into* in the one instance as in the other.

The average Campbellite is a great stickler for a literal interpretation of God's Word. According to his creed, the Bible means exactly what it says, and says exactly what it means. Hence, when he reads "were baptized into Jesus Christ," he understands that they were literally put into Christ when they were put into the waters of baptism. And yet he will not accept of the phrase baptize into repentance, which rests on as good authority as the rendering of *baptidzo eis*

metanoian, as “were baptized into Jesus Christ,” is of *ebaptisthemen eis Christon Iesoun*. But as we are not literally baptized into repentance, so neither are we literally baptized into Jesus Christ. And yet we are baptized into Christ, by profession, as truly we are baptized into His death, by profession. That is, in our baptism we set forth in likeness the great fundamental truths of the gospel; to-wit: that Christ died for our sins; that He was buried, and that He rose again. And we profess to be dead, indeed, unto sin, in the act of being buried with Christ in baptism, and to be alive unto God, in the raising up from the waters, with the professed determination to walk in the newness of life.

CHAPTER X.

THE CAMPBELLITE CHURCH NOT THE CHURCH OF
CHRIST, BECAUSE IT DENIES THE PERSONAL
PRESENCE AND WORK OF THE HOLY
SPIRIT IN THE CONVERSION OF
SINNERS, AND IN THE COM-
FORTING OF BELIEV-
ERS.

Campbellites deny that man is so depraved as to need anything in his conversion but the simple unaided light and force of divine truth. Lard's Review of Jeter's Campbellism Examined, p. 135, speaks as follows: "True, we all inherit that frail nature which renders us so extremely susceptible of temptation. Nay, we will even grant that we inherit it in an aggravated form, which is the only form in which we do inherit it. But we inherit no form of depravity so inveterate as to affect the perfect freedom of the will, close the heart against the truth, or render man insusceptible of being moved by motives; in a word, no form which renders him incapable of

being converted by the simple unaided light and force of divine truth.”

“But this frailty or weakness is not sin: it is only a condition without which there had been no sin. Nor is it a consequence of Adam’s sin. Adam possessed it before he sinned, else he had not sinned; hence it is not a *consequence* of his sin. It is, however, a condition of sin, since without it Adam could not have sinned; but it is only a condition. Nor, perhaps, will facts warrant the conclusion that this frailty is, even in our case, greatly increased. For greater weakness in sinning was never displayed than by Adam. He yielded to the first temptation ever presented to him, without, so far as we know, offering the slightest resistance. No one of his descendants ever did more.”

The above is valuable Campbellite testimony. For Mr. Campbell endorsed Mr. Lard to write the book from which it is taken. On the preceding page Mr. Lard says: “We agree to the mournful truth that man is depraved, *i. e.*, that his reason has been greatly clouded by the fall, that his tastes and feelings have been perverted, and that he no longer reflects the image—the moral image—of his great original as he once re-

flected it ; that he now reflects it only as a broken mirror reflects the image of the face before it. The three respects in which man has chiefly suffered by the fall, we conceive to be his subjection to mortality, his loss of the moral image of a kind creator, and his greater exposedness to temptation and sin."

Pretty good doctrine of depravity for a Campbellite in this last quotation. But on the next page, as seen in the first quotation in this chapter, he takes it all back, and simmers it down to a mere frailty or weakness. That we inherit it in an aggravated form. But that we don't inherit it from Adam; and that we don't inherit it in a form which renders man *incapable of being converted by the simple unaided light and force of divine truth*. And he keeps on till he has this innocent weakness in us no greater than it was in Adam before he fell. God pronounced everything very good before Adam fell. This makes the doctrine of depravity, as held by the Campbellites, a very good thing. And man is still good, and very good, by nature.

But what saith the Scriptures? Paul says we "were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." Ephesians 2:3. "And GOD saw

that the wickedness of man *was* great in the earth, and *that* every imagination of the thoughts of his heart *was* only evil continually." Gen. 6:5. And "The heart *is* deceitful above all *things*, and desperately wicked; who can know it?" Jer. 17:9. God's word says that men are *by nature the children of wrath*; that the wickedness of man was great in the earth; that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually; that the heart is deceitful above all things; and then asks who can know it? But the word of a prominent and well endorsed Campbellite says that this "frailty or weakness is not sin." And says it is not greatly increased, in our case, over what it was in Adam before he fell!! Reader, which will you believe, the Word of God, or the word of the Campbellite?

Mr. Campbell and his followers shall speak for themselves in explanation of their doctrine on this subject. Mr. Campbell says: "*The argument is the power of the Spirit of man, and the only power which one Spirit can exert over another is its argument.*" How often do we see a whole congregation roused into certain actions, expressions of joy or sorrow, by the spirit of one man. Yet no person supposes that his spirit has liter-

ally deserted his body and literally entered into every man and woman in the house, although it is often said he has filled them with his spirit. But how does that spirit located in the head of yonder little man fill all the thousands around him with joy or sadness, with fear and trembling, with zeal or indignation, as the case may be? How has it displayed so much power over so minds? *By words uttered by the tongue; by ideas communicated to the minds of the hearers.* In this way only can moral power be displayed. From such premises we may say that all the moral power which can be exerted on human beings is, and must of necessity be, in the arguments addressed to them. No other power than moral power can operate on minds, and this power must always be clothed in words addressed to the eye or ear. Thus we reason when revelation is altogether out of view. And when we think of the power of the Spirit of God exerted upon minds or human spirits, it is impossible for us to imagine that that power can consist in anything else but words or arguments. Thus, in the nature of things we are prepared to expect verbal communications from the Spirit of God, if that Spirit operates at all upon our spirits. As the moral power of every

man is in his arguments, so is the moral power of the Spirit of God in his arguments." Mill. Har., Vol. 2, p. 294.

Mr. Campbell says again: "*As the spirit of man puts forth all its moral power in the words which it fills with ideas, so the Spirit of God puts forth all its converting power in the words which it fills with ideas.* Miracles cannot convert; they can only obtain a favorable hearing of the converting arguments. If they fail to obtain a favorable hearing, the arguments which they prove are as impotent as an unknown tongue. If the Spirit of God has spoken all its arguments, or if the New and Old Testaments contain all the arguments which can be offered to reconcile man to God, and to purify them who are reconciled, then all the power of the Holy Spirit which can operate on the human mind is spent; and he that is not sanctified and saved by these cannot be saved by angels or spirits, human or divine." Mill. Har., Vol. 2, p. 295. Quoted in Text Book on Campbellism.

Mr. Lard says, in his Review of Campbellism Examined, p. 83: "But what do we mean when we say the Spirit operates through the truth? We mean that it operates *by* the truth; that is, that

divine truth is itself the vital power by which in all cases the Spirit effects conversion; in other words, that the Spirit spends on the mind of the sinner in conversion no influence except such as resides in the Truth as divine, as of the Spirit.'

Mr. Campbell also says, that "it (the Bible) is not called 'the Sword of the Spirit' so much on account of him who uses it as of him who fashioned it." Mill. Har., new series, vol. 1, p. 379. Quoted in Text Book.

In The Life and Times of Benjamin Franklin, p. 389, we read: "The Protestant sects, appropriating to themselves the descriptive term 'evangelical,' held that the essence of religion is the direct or mystic influence of the Holy Spirit in the soul. The knowledge of the forgiveness of sin and all the blessings of God's grace are an experience in the soul, just as hunger and thirst, or headache and toothache are an experience in the body. All that men could learn was to expect such a divine power, and all that they could do was to pray for it. * * * The Reformers, on the other hand, held that the truths of religion are a revelation in the Word of God, and that he who would know and enjoy them should apply his mind to understand the Bible. * * *

“He (the Holy Spirit) was to them an intelligent person, who has communicated his knowledge of the things of God in the words He has spoken. This intelligence is a sacred history, to be understood and believed through the exercise of man’s natural faculties. They were on this account sneered at as having only a ‘head religion.’ ”

Now, for a summing up of this testimony. Mr. Campbell says: “All the moral power which can be exerted on human beings is, and must of necessity be, in the arguments addressed to them,” and that all moral power is in words or arguments addressed to the eye or ear; that it is impossible to imagine that that power can consist in anything but words or arguments, that we are to expect verbal communications from the Spirit of God, f that Spirit operates at all upon our spirits. But we know that all moral power does not consist in words or arguments. It is proverbial that “actions speak louder than words.” And in Philippians 2:13 we read: “For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure.”

Mr. Campbell further testifies that the Spirit of God puts forth *all its converting and sanctifying power in the words which it fills with its ideas;*

and he concludes that all the power of the Holy Spirit which can operate on the human mind is spent. His idea is that the Holy Spirit has spoken all His arguments in the Bible; and that, therefore, He has spent all his power which can operate on the human mind. But such testimony needs no refutation.

J. A. Headington and Joseph Franklin, in their *Life and Times of Ben. Franklin*, say of the Holy Spirit that “He was to them (*i. e.*, the Reformers), an intelligent person, who has communicated his knowledge of the things of God in the words he has spoken. This intelligence is a sacred history to be understood and believed through the exercise of man’s natural faculties. As the Campbellites claimed to understand and believe the Bible intelligence through the exercise of their natural faculties, of course they excluded the supernatural—the efficient presence and power of the Holy Spirit Himself.

The testimony of Mr. Lard is quite valuable, in this connection, for several reasons, among which may be mentioned his ability as writer, the clear, concise manner in which he explains their doctrine concerning Spirit influence, and the fact that he was especially endorsed by Mr. Campbell

for the writing of the book, from which we copy his explanation. He says: "*The Spirit spends on the mind of the sinner in conversion no influence except such as resides in the truth as divine, as of the spirit.* That is to say, the truth is divine, and that it emanates from the Spirit of God, and that an influence resides in it because of its divine character and origin. But that the Spirit spends on the mind of the sinner no direct influence whatever.

Mr. Lard also says, in his *Review of Campbellism Examined*, p. 74: "According to Mr. Campbell's theory, conversion is in every case effected by the influence of the Spirit; but then comes the question, what influence is meant? He denies that it is an influence 'distinct from and above the truth,' and maintains that the truth itself is that influence." So when you hear or read the gospel, that is all the influence there is. In the mind of a Campbellite, the Holy Spirit never comes in contact with the human spirit.

Mr. Lard is a very important witness. Hear him once more. He says: "From all the premises, therefore, we conclude that Mr. Jeter's doctrine, that in conversion the divine nature is communicated, is a sheer fiction; and his conclu-

sion, that it is effected by an influence distinct from and above the Truth, a gross non-sequitur.”* But Peter teaches that Christians are “partakers of the divine nature.” See 2 Peter 1:4, and context.

About the year 1857 Prof. R. Richardson, of Bethany College, wrote some essays against Locke’s philosophy. These appear to have been the starting point of a great dissension among the Campbellites. The Life and Times of Benjamin Franklin, pp. 354, 355, speaks as follows concerning the views of Professor Richardson which brought about this result: “The speculations upon the ‘inner consciousness’ of Christians appear to have been started by the promulgation of Prof. R. Richardson’s views in regard to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. He held the views entertained by many others before and since, that the promise of the Holy Spirit as a paraclete was not to the apostles only, but to all Christians. The Spirit personally present in the believer, operates upon his spiritual nature so as to quicken his perception of truth and give him a better realization of the truth of the promises than can come of a mere intellectual perception.” H. T. Anderson wrote

*Review Camp. Examined, pp. 51, 52.

approvingly of Prof. Richardson's views. The authors of the *Life and Times of Benjamin Franklin* say: "The three persons who became the most prominent in the agitation of this subject were Thomas J. Melish, of Cincinnati; G. N. Carman, of Ashland, Ohio, and W. S. Russell, of Jacksonville, Illinois." These men contended that we must be "quickened by the Holy Spirit," and that without this "quickening none can be spiritually minded or enjoy the things of the Spirit." They also contended for "The Holy Spirit as personally and directly the agent converting and sanctifying men through the truth." These sentiments could not be tolerated among the Campbellites. Their earnest advocacy by Melish, Carman and Russell brought down upon the heads of these men the most violent opposition of the Campbellite fraternity. Messrs. Headington and Franklin speak of this opposition as follows: "When, therefore, a party arose among themselves (the 'Reformers,') who taught that 'that is never called the Spirit's influence which is exerted merely through secondary agencies,' but that 'the Spirit always works internally,' it was as if a party should arise in a teetotallers' society and teach that the use of ardent spirits is

wholesome and beneficial to men. It was an intolerable heresy, and a storm of opposition arose which soon deluged the 'defection' and washed it out of existence. *Life and Times of Benjamin Franklin*, p. 387.

This interesting bit of history is faithfully recorded from a Campbellite standpoint, in the *Life and Times of Benjamin Franklin*, between pages 354 and 388. It is valuable as demonstrating that the Campbellites, as a people, are so heretical in their doctrine concerning the work of the Holy Spirit, that they will not tolerate persons in their denomination who teach the Bible doctrine on this subject.

CHAPTER XI.

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE CONVERSION
OF SINNERS AND IN THE HELPING BELIEVERS,
SUBSTANTIATED BY THE BIBLE.

Our first proof is the promise of our Savior in connection with His commission to His disciples: "And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Matt. 28:20. The value of this passage as a proof of the personal presence and agency of the Holy Spirit, in the conversion of sinners, is determined by the meaning of the phrase: "I am with you." In order to establish its meaning, we invite the attention of the reader to the following Scriptures: Deut. 20:1-4.

"When thou goest out to battle against thine enemies, and seest horses, and chariots *and* a people more than thou, be not afraid of them: for the Lord thy God *is* with thee, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt. And it shall be, when ye are come nigh unto the battle, that the priest shall approach and speak unto the people. And shall say unto them, Hear, O Israel, ye

approach this day unto battle against your enemies ; let not your hearts faint, fear not, and do not tremble, neither be ye terrified because of them ; For the Lord your God *is* he that goeth with you, to fight for you against your enemies to save you."

If infidelity were personified, it were too much for her to say that the words: "The Lord thy God is with thee," signify nothing more than that the Israelites would have the word of God with them when they went into battle. "The Lord thy God is with thee, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." The Lord Himself, with His Almighty hand, and out-stretched arm, brought up the people of Israel out of the land of Egypt. Then the Lord was to be *with them, to fight for them against their enemies, to save them*. And this necessitates His presence and agency.

Deut. 31 : 6, 8 verses: "Be strong and of a good courage, fear not, nor be afraid of them : for the Lord thy God, he *it is* that doth go with thee ; he will not fail thee, nor forsake thee. And the Lord, he *it is* that doth go before thee ; he will be with thee, he will not fail thee, neither forsake thee : fear not, neither be dismayed."

Nothing short of the Divine presence can be meant by these passages: Joshua 1: 5. "There shall not any man be able to stand before thee all the days of thy life; as I was with Moses, so I will be with thee; I will not fail thee, nor forsake thee." 1 Chronicles, 28: 20: "And David said to Solomon his son, Be strong and of good courage, and do *it*: fear not, nor be dismayed: for the Lord God, *even* my God, *will be* with thee; he will not fail thee, nor forsake thee, until thou hast finished all the work for the service of the house of the Lord."

David did not mean that the Word of God merely, would be with his son Solomon in the building of the temple. But the Lord Himself would be with him.

Isa., 41:10: "Fear thou not; for I *am* with thee; be not dismayed; for I *am* thy God: I will strengthen thee: yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness."

This passage, like the rest, cannot mean less than the presence and agency of the Holy Spirit. See also Ex. 33:14, 15 and Num. 14: 42. But shall we persuade ourselves that all these passages, promising that God would be with His people,

signify nothing less than His presence and agency ; but that when the Savior promises in His great commission to be with His disciples, that it means no such thing? And this exception, too, as to the meaning of the phrase, "I am with you," must be made, because the Campbellites don't want the Holy Spirit to be with Christ's disciples as they go teaching the gospel to the nations! Could anything be more absurd and foolish? We think not.

We have proof also in Acts 18 : 9, 10, that the promise of the Lord to be with His people is a pledge both of His actual presence and assistance. We read : "Then spake the Lord to Paul in the night by a vision, Be not afraid, but speak, and hold not thy peace : For I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee to hurt thee : for I have much people in this city."

Paul not only understood that the Lord would be present to protect him, but also to give success to his labors ; for, being encouraged by the promise of the Divine presence, "he continued there a year and six months, teaching the Word of God among them." Verse 11. Mind you, it was at Corinth, where the Lord made this special promise to be with him ; and He afterward wrote

to the Corinthians, asserting the Divine agency in their conversion. He says: "Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man? I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase. So then neither is he that planteth any thing, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase." 1 Cor. 3:5-7.

Paul and Apollos were nothing but the instruments by whom the Corinthians believed—and they only believed as the Lord gave to every man. Paul planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase. He that planteth is not anything, neither is he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase. Faith is one of the gifts of the Spirit. [See 1 Cor. 12:9.]

Our second proof is in the fact that the hand of the Lord is said to have been with the disciples in their preaching. In Acts 11:20, 21, we read:

"And some of them were men of Cyprus and Cyrene, which, when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Grecians, preaching the Lord Jesus. And the hand of the Lord was with them; and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord."

The expression—"hand of the Lord," in the Bible signifies the exercise of Divine power. In proof of this proposition, we cite the following:

Exodus, 13:3. "And Moses said unto the people, Remember this day, in which ye came out from Egypt, out of the house of bondage; for by strength of hand the Lord brought you out from this *place*."

Let it be remembered that the Lord did something more in bringing about the release of Israel from Egyptian bondage, than just to send His Word to Pharoah. Numbers, 11:23. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Is the Lord's hand waxed short? thou shalt see now whether my word shall come to pass unto thee or not." The hand of the Lord would bring His Word to pass.

Jòshua, 4:23-24: "For the Lord your God dried up the waters of Jordan from before you, until ye were passed over, as the Lord your God did to the Red sea, which he dried up from before us, until we were gone over: That all the people of the earth might know the hand of the Lord, that it *is* mighty: that ye might fear the Lord your God for ever." "Hand of the Lord" in this passage cannot signify any thing else but the exercise of Divine power.

1 Samuel, 7:13: "So the Philistines were subdued, and they came no more into the coast of Israel: and the hand of the Lord was against the Philistines all the days of Samuel." The Lord worked against the Philistines.

Isa. 59:1. "Behold, the Lord's hand is not shortened, that it cannot save." The Lord's hand saves.

Isa. 50:2: "Is my hand shortened at all, that it cannot redeem? or have I no power to deliver?"

Exodus, 9:3: "Behold, the hand of the Lord is upon thy cattle which *is* in the field, upon the horses, upon the asses, upon the camels, upon the oxen, and upon the sheep: *there shall be* a very grievous murrain." The fulfillment of this prediction is recorded in the 6th verse: "And the Lord did that thing on the morrow, and all the cattle in Egypt died." Here was the exercise of Divine power.

1 Samuel, 5:6: "But the hand of the Lord was heavy upon them of Ashdod, and he destroyed them, and smote them with emerods, *even* Ashdod and the coasts thereof." Almighty power again.

Acts, 13:11: "And now, behold, the hand of

Lord *is* upon thee, and thou shalt be blind, not seeing the sun for a season. And immediately there fell on him a mist and a darkness; and he went about seeking some to lead him by the hand." O, Campbellite! Will you deny that God smote this man with blindness? [See also Ezra, 7:9 and Judges, 2:15.]

Reader, have we not established the proposition that the words, "the hand of the Lord," signify the direct exercise of Almighty power? If we have not, surely no proposition can be established by Scripture proof. When we read in Acts 11:21, that the hand of the Lord was with His disciples in the conversion of sinners, we are bound to believe that Almighty power was exerted in their salvation. It is infidelity not to believe it.

Our third proof of the work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of sinners, is the fact stated in Galatians, 4:28: "Now we, brethren as Isaac was, are the children of promise." By consulting the 17th chapter of Genesis, the reader will find an account of the supernatural origin of Isaac. And as the birth of Isaac was the result of Divine agency, so the birth of the spiritual seed of Abraham is the result of Divine agency.

Divine power was necessary to make the dead procreative faculties of Isaac's parents alive. So is Divine power necessary to make the dead sinner alive to God. This doctrine is fully substantiated by Ephesians, 2:1: "And you *hath he quickened*, who were dead in trespasses and sins." And thus does God fulfill His promise, both as to the natural and spiritual seed of Abraham.

Our fourth proof of the direct exercise of Almighty power in the conversion of sinners is found in Ephesians, 2:4, 6: "But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us. Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, [by grace ye are saved]; And hath raised *us* up together, and made *us* sit together in heavenly *places* in Christ Jesus." To quicken is to make alive. God, because of His great love to us, even when we were dead in sins, has made us alive together with Christ. As He raised up Christ from a natural death, to die no more; so has He raised us up from spiritual death to life everlasting. And as the direct exercise of Divine power was essential to the resurrection of Christ, so is the direct exercise of Divine power necessary to make us alive from spiritual death.

Our fifth proof is in the following words: "Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." Jno. 16:7, 8. If Christ had meant that the word alone would come when He went away, He doubtless, would have said so. Then the masculine gender, used here with reference to the Holy Spirit, is incompatible with the idea that the Word of God alone is the promised Comforter or Advocate. Then, again, Christ said: "When he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." The word reprove, here, means convince or convict. The Advocate would convict the world of sin. Here is the Divine agency again.

Our sixth proof is in Hebrews, 8:8-10: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued

not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days saith the Lord ; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts : and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people." God wrote the covenant He made with their fathers, when He brought them out of Egypt, on tables of stone. But in the new covenant, He says : " I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts." The word alone can no more write itself upon the hearts of the people, than the law could write itself on the tables of stone. This is God's act. He wrote the law on the stone, and He will write it in the hearts of His people.

Proof seventh. Acts, 16 : 14, furnishes proof of the work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of sinners : " And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshipped God, heard us : whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul." The Word of God spoken by Paul was one thing, and the Lord opening Lydia's heart was altogether another thing.

Our eighth proof is in the two following passages: 1 Cor. 5:17. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature," and "We are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works." The man who is in Christ is a new creature. And we are created in Christ to good works. When a man gets into Christ, therefore, he is made a new creature or created to good works. It is the providence of God only to create. Therefore, God performs the work of creating us anew in Christ Jesus.

The word Christian is from the Greek word *Christos*, which signifies the Anointed. Christ is the Lord's Anointed, King and Priest. Christians are, in a sense, Kings and Priests unto God, and are Anointed of the Holy Spirit. 1 Jno. 2:20-27. "Ye have an unction from the Holy One." "But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him." But as the Campbellites deny the personal contact or impact of the Holy Spirit upon the spirit of the believer, they are not entitled to the name Christian at all.

CHAPTER XII.

CAMPBELLITES NOT THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, BE-
CAUSE THEY PERVERT THE BIBLE ORDER
OF CHRIST'S COMMANDMENTS.

It is a well known fact that the Campbellites preach that faith in Christ is the first duty of the sinner who hears the gospel. We have never known an exception. Every Campbellite preacher teaches that faith is the first duty of the sinner. But this is not according to the gospel of Christ. By consulting Mark the 1st chapter, you will see that the ministry of John the Baptist was the beginning of the gospel. Then turn to Mathew, 3d chapter and 1st and 2nd verses, and read: "In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea. And saying, Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

This command to repent was the first commandment promulgated by "the voice of one crying in the wilderness," in the beginning of the Gospel.

Christ also preached repentance as the first duty of the sinner who hears the gospel. In Mathew 4:17 we read: "From that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

Repentance was also the first commandment under the preaching of the apostles. In Mark 6th chapter we read that Christ called and sent out the apostles, two by two, and that "they went out and preached that men should repent." And in Acts 2d chapter, when the Pentecostians heard the Gospel under the preaching of Peter, we read that "they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men *and* brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

Yes, Peter said unto them, repent. And this was the first thing he said to them. But this is not the first thing a Campbellite would say in such cases. Who ever heard of a Campbellite telling a poor enquiring sinner that it was his first duty to repent?

It is a remarkable fact that in every instance

where repentance and faith are mentioned in connection in the Word of God, repentance always stands first. And it is also a remarkable fact that in every instance where the two are mentioned in connection in the word of Campbellism, that faith always stands first. In Mark 1:14-15, we read: "Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, And saying, the time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel."

Notice, reader, Jesus said "Repent ye, and believe the gospel." But you never heard a Campbellite preach that way. And should a member of their denomination preach according to Bible teaching, he would place himself in hot water among them, and would cease to be a Campbellite.

In Acts the 20th chapter, we read: "For Paul had determined to sail by Ephesus, because he would not spend the time in Asia: for he hasted, if it were possible for him, to be at Jerusalem the day of Pentecost. And from Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the church. And when they were come to him, he said unto them, Ye know, from the first day that I came

into Asia, after what manner I have been with you at all seasons, Serving the Lord with all humility of mind, and with many tears, and temptations, which befell me by the lying in wait of the Jews: *And* how I kept back nothing that was profitable *unto you*, but have shewed you, and have taught you publicly, and from house to house, Testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ."

This gives the order in which Paul preached repentance and faith. He also says, Heb. 6:1: "Therefore leaving the principles or the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God."

Yes, repentance from dead works, precedes faith toward God.

In Mathew 21:32 our Savior, in speaking to the Jews, said: "John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not; but the publicans and the harlots believed him; and ye, when ye had seen *it*, repented not afterward, that ye might believe him."

According to this passage, repentance is necessary in order to faith. Campbellites have con-

tended that this passage does not prove the necessity of repentance before faith, because in the original *metemelomai* is used instead of *metanoieo*, the word generally used to signify repent. Our answer to this is, that it can't be that the Savior would require anything less than repentance in this passage. For the Savior would certainly not require repentance before faith in the other passages, we have cited, and then not require it in this instance.

Campbellites say: "Where the Bible speaks we speak, where the Bible is silent, we are silent." But the Bible speaks repentance before faith, and Campbellites speak faith before repentance. It is a sin to pervert the commandments of God. Campbellites agree to this proposition in its application to Pedeo-baptists. But the rule must reverse itself when it applies to them. For they agree that the Pedeo-baptist sins when he pretends to baptise before the exercise of faith, as in the case of infants. But we submit that the same Lord who said: "He that believeth and is baptized," also said, "Repent and believe the gospel." And how is it, Oh! ye Campbellites!! that you speak only as the Bible speaks?

CHAPTER XIII.

FALSE THEORY OF CAMPBELLISM AS TO THE BEGIN-
NING OF THE GOSPEL ON THE DAY
OF PENTECOST.

According to Campbellism, the gospel first began to be preached on the day of Pentecost. This is so patent that proof is unnecessary. Let him who doubts ask the first Campbellite preacher he meets when the gospel began to be preached. Every Campbellite preacher in the land will tell you that Peter on the day of Pentecost preached the first gospel sermon; that this was the beginning of the gospel. But this positively contradicts the Word of God. Reader, turn to the first chapter of the gospel by Mark, 1st to the 4th verses, and read: "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the son of God: As it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee. The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. John did baptize in the wil-

derness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.”

’Tis funny, ain’t it, for a people to be always telling you that they preach nothing but the Bible, that the Word of God is good enough, and then to no more regard a plain statement of that Word, than they would the statement of a Hottentot? According to the Word of God in the first few verses in the first chapter of Mark, the ministry of John the Baptist was the beginning of the gospel, and Campbellism can’t help it.

In Mark 1st chapter and 14th verse we read: “Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God.”

And in Luke 4th chapter, 16th to the 21st verses we read: “And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and stood up for to read. And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written, The Spirit, of the Lord *is* upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliver-

ance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, To preach the acceptable year of the Lord. And he closed the book, and he gave *it* again to the minister, and sat down. And the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on him. And he began to say unto them, This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears."

Read this passage over again, and see that it is not the Gospel in prospect, or in prophecy, that is here spoken of, but the real gospel itself, in fulfillment of prophecy.

In Mathew 4:23 we read: "And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of sickness and all manner of disease among the people."

Yes, Jesus went about all Galilee *preaching the gospel* of the kingdom. But Campbellism says He did no such thing. And then with great show of innocence, and in the most blaitant manner, says: "Where the Bible speaks we speak, where the Bible is silent we are silent!"

And in Mathew 9:35 we read: "And Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the

kingdom, and healing every sickness and every disease among the people.”

In Mathew 11th chapter and 5th verse Christ said: “The poor have the gospel preached to them.” But this so-called Christian Church says the poor did not then have the gospel preached to them.

In Luke the 9th chapter and 1st to the 6th verses we have it stated that Jesus sent out His twelve disciples and that they “Went through the towns preaching the gospel.”

But enough. He who will not believe these plain declarations of the Word of God would not believe “though one rose from the dead.”

The preaching of the gospel mentioned in the foregoing proof texts occurred during Christ’s life time upon earth. But the day of Pentecost at which the Campbellites say the gospel began to be preached, did not occur till after Christ’s death, resurrection and ascension into glory.

The passage the Campbellites rely upon as a proof text that the gospel was not preached till Pentecost, is a prophecy found in Isaiah 2nd chapter and 3d verse, and reads: “Out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.” This is like the Pedit-baptists quot-

ing the word of our Savior "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven," to prove that we should take little infant baby children to some preacher and have water poured on their heads. The trouble with these proof texts is, that they say nothing about the things that are proposed to be proven by them. There is no passage in the Bible that can be tortured into a statement that the gospel was to begin, or did begin, on the day of Pentecost.

CHAPTER XIV.

FALSE THEORY OF CAMPBELLISM AS TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CHURCH, AND THE SETTING UP OF THE KINGDOM ON THE DAY OF PENTECOST.

Pentecost is not only the beginning of the gospel, in the mind of a Campbellite, but also of the Church of Christ, and Kingdom of Heaven, as well. But do the Scriptures teach that the Church of Christ and Kingdom of Heaven had their beginning on the day of Pentecost? *Not one word of it.* And here every Campbellite is ready to drawl over the words—"Out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." But these words say nothing about the beginning of the Church of Christ or Kingdom of Heaven on the day of Pentecost.

This theory of the Pentecostal beginning of the Church and Kingdom of Christ, denies to the Son of God the privilege of setting up His own Kingdom. But do the Scriptures teach that Peter, or any of the apostles, or all of them together, were

to set up the Kingdom, and build the Church for Christ, and that the Kingdom and Church should be destroyed after being built, and built again by Alexander Campbell on a more enduring foundation, and with better promises? *No, sir; they do not.* But they do teach the very reverse of this. In Daniel, the 2d chapter, and 44th verse, we read: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, *but* it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever." Let the Word of God be true, though it makes Campbellism a falsehood. Reader, turn now, to Matthew, 16th chapter, and 18th verse, and read: "I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

Our Divine Savior uttered these words, and who but a false teacher will so contradict them as to say, either, that Christ did not build His own Church; or, that after it was built, it was prevailed against and needed to be rebuilt by Mr. Campbell? But the so-called Christian Church is equal

to the emergency. O, modesty! where art thou? O, shame! where is thy blush?

Turn again to Dan., 2:44, and read: "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom." It is generally agreed that "These Kings" refer to the Roman Cæsar. In those days, a man was sent from God, whose name was John, to make ready a people prepared for the Lord. [See Jno., 1:6 and Luke, 1:17.]

John filled his mission. He made ready a prepared people for the Lord, and Christ came to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. After His baptism, and the descent of the Holy Spirit, and the audible voice from Heaven, announcing Him to be the Son of God, in whom He was well pleased, our Savior began to gather about Him His disciples, and He dates His Kingdom from that time. Hear; oh, earth! The *Son of God* will testify. Yes, hear Him! He says: "From the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force." Matt. 11:12. Yes, our blessed Lord says the Kingdom of Heaven suffered from the days of John the Baptist. Then it existed from the days of John the Baptist, as no being can suffer before it exists. If we believe

not the word of Christ, whose word can we believe? This so-called Christian Church does not believe this testimony of Jesus Christ which we have here adduced.

Hear the testimony of the Lord again. He says: "The law and the prophets *were* until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." Luke, 16:16. Yes, the Kingdom of God was preached and pressed into from the time of John. And, in as much as it is an impossibility to press into a house which has no existence, so it would have been impossible to have pressed into the Kingdom of God from the time of John the Baptist, had not that Kingdom been in existence from that time.

In every one of the accounts of Christ's trial, it is recorded that He confessed to being a King. This is the "good confession" which He witnessed before Pontius Pilate. But He could not have confessed that He was a King, at the time, if He had not then possessed a Kingdom, and He could not have possessed a Kingdom that had no existence.

And as to the existence of the Church before Pentecost, Christ said: "Tell it unto the

Church." Matt., 18:17. They also observed the Lord's Supper, which is admitted to be a Church Ordinance, on the night of His betrayal. Not only so, but they actually performed Church business, in the election of a brother to fill the place of Judas, who by transgression fell. [See Acts, 1st chapter.] And all this before the day of Pentecost.

CHAPTER XV.

MR. CAMPBELL, THE HEAD AND FOUNDER OF THE
SO-CALLED CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

Mr. Campbell, in 1847, made a tour to Europe, and, in going, he received a letter of recommendation from Henry Clay, the well-known statesman of Kentucky. In that recommendation we have the following language, (Vol. 2, p. 547, of *Memoirs of Campbell*): “Dr. Campbell is among the most eminent citizens of the United States, distinguished for his great learning and ability, for his successful devotion to the education of the youth, for his piety, and as the head and founder of one of the most important and respectable religious communities in the United States.” Quoted in *American Baptist Flag*.

The *American Cyclopædia*, vol. 3, p. 662, says: “Campbell, Alexander, founder of the religious sect calling themselves Disciples of Christ, but commonly known as Campbellites, born in County Antrim, Ireland, in June 1786, died at Bethany, W. Va., March 4th, 1866.”

Disciples of Christ, "Commonly called Campbellites, from Alexander Campbell, founder of the sect, who seceded from the 'secession' branch of the Presbyterian Church of in Western Pennsylvania in 1812." Dictionary of Relig. Denom. in Hichcock's Analysis.

Mr. Charles V. Segar, (Life of A. Campbell, p. 25,) says: "Alexander Campbell soon became chiefly and prominently known as the recognized head of a new religious movement, the object of which was to restore primitive Christianity in all its simplicity and beauty. Out of this movement has grown a people, who choose to call themselves Christians or Disciples, now numbering not less than five hundred thousand members in the United States." Quoted in *American Baptist Flag*.

Mr. Charles V. Segar was a Campbellite, and he testifies that Mr. Campbell soon became chiefly and prominently known as the *recognized head* of a new religious movement, etc. Yes, they recognized him as their head, and chiefly and prominently so.

Now, reader, hear the testimony of Prof. R. Richardson, another prominent Campbellite. In his *Memoirs of Mr. Campbell*, vol. 1, p. 401,

says: "From the moment that Thomas Campbell concluded to follow the example of his son in relation to baptism, he conceded to him in effect the guidance of the whole religious movement." Quoted in Ray-Lucas Debate, p. 42.

Yes, conceded to Alexander Campbell "the guidance of the whole religious movement." And it appears that Prof. Richardson fully recognized this guidance, for he says: (Vol. 1, p. 510, *Memoirs of Campbell*.) "While Mr. Campbell was fearless, and self-reliant and firm, Mr. Scott was naturally timid, diffident and yielding; and while the former was calm, steady and prudent, the latter was excitable, variable and precipitate. The one like the North Star, was ever in position, unaffected by terrestrial influences; the other, like the Magnetic Needle, was often disturbed and trembling on its center, yet ever returning, or seeking to return to its true direction."

Mr. Campbell was "the North Star." The other poor fellow was like "the Magnetic Needle," variable and trembling around, "yet ever returning, or seeking to return to its true direction," which was to point to Mr. Campbell.

Hear Mr. Richardson again: (*Memoirs*, vol. 2, p. 295.) "Mr. Campbell found himself to be

the center of a constantly widening circle of influence, and, under Divine Providence, *an acknowledged guide*, to a large and intelligent community, zealously engaged in the work of reformation.” (*Our Italics.*)

Remember, reader, Prof. Richardson was a man of note among these Disciples, a teacher in Mr. Campbell’s College, at Bethany, Va., and an accredited historian; and he says Mr. Campbell was the “center,” and “an acknowledged guide” to these intelligent people, “zealously engaged in the work of reformation.” Better call it a deformation!

We will let Prof. Richardson speak again. Hear him. He says of Mr. Campbell: “Like a balance-wheel, he regulated the entire movement of the reformation, and, on repeated occasions, preserved it from the disasters which were impending from the ambitions or the rashness of its friends.” *Memoirs of Campbell*, vol. 2, p. 668. Quoted in *Ray-Lucas Debate*, pp. 60-61.

Yes, Mr. Campbell, as the head and founder, “*Like a balance-wheel, regulated the entire movement*” of this pretentious reformation.

According to the Word of God, Jesus Christ

is "The head over all things" to His Church. [See Eph., 1:22.] But according to Mr. Campbell's historian, Mr. Campbell himself regulated the entire movement which calls itself "The Christian Church." The Church of which Mr. Campbell is head and founder, *cannot* be the Church of which Jesus Christ is the head and founder. It would be about as smart to say that Alexander Campbell is Jesus Christ, as to say that the Church of which he is the head and founder, is the Church of Christ.

CHAPTER XVI.

FALSE PLEA OF CAMPBELLITES IN SELF-JUSTIFICATION FOR BELONGING TO A CHURCH SET UP BY MR. CAMPBELL.

Campbellites claim that the Church of Christ had failed upon the earth, that the bride, the Lamb's wife, had fallen and become a harlot. Yea, more, they claim that the Christian religion and the gospel of Christ were lost to the world. They claim that this was the sad condition of the world at the time that Alexander Campbell came as a mighty counsellor, a Reformer of the Church, a Restorer of Christianity, and of the gospel of Christ to the world. Are these things so? Had the Church of Christ either failed or fallen? Has the Christian religion, as instituted by the Son of God, stood the test of ages? And has the gospel of Christ had a continuous chain of advocates from the time of Christ to the present? If so, then Campbellism is a fraud and a counterfeit. And the very plea for its existence is a slander upon the Church of Christ.

The Campbellite plea that the Church of Christ and the institutions of the Christian religion had failed and come to nought and that Mr. Campbell has restored them to the world, is incredible. For if God, manifest in the flesh and possessing all power in heaven and upon earth, could not establish a Church that would endure to the end of the world, and continue faithful to Him; surely Mr. Campbell could not do it. To say that he could would be to exalt Mr. Campbell above Jesus Christ as a wiser Master-builder than He. But this would be blasphemy.

But what saith the Scripture? Does the Bible teach that Christ's Church and His religion should fail, and that Mr. Campbell should restore Christianity? No, sir. There is not one word in the Bible about the failure of Christ's Church or or His religion. And not a word about Mr. Campbell as the restorer of a lost Christianity.

But to the law and the testimony. We read in Daniel 2:44: "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." It is generally agreed that the

kings referred to in this passage are the Roman Emperors. At that time Jesus of Nazareth did set up a kingdom. He is God of heaven. Campbellites themselves agree with us that this passage refers to the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ. If so, then it is established that the Church of Christ *shall never be destroyed*, neither *shall it be left to other people*, and it *shall stand forever*.

In Mat. 16:18 our Savior said: "Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." The phrase, "The gates of hell comprehends all the powers" of evil—all that is opposed to God. The expression, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it," signifies that the Church of Christ shall stand secure though all the combined powers of earth and hell are brought to bear against it. Jesus Christ Himself, as crucified for the sins of the whole world, is the solid rock upon which He has built His Church. He is the firm, the sure, the everlasting foundation of the Church of God. Built upon this rock by a Divine hand and favored by an Almighty Protector, the Church of Christ *shall not be prevailed against*.

With these Scriptures before us, what shall we think of those persons who are guilty of circu-

lating the report that the blessed, pure bride of Christ has fallen—is a harlot, and needs to be reformed by Mr. Campbell.

No insult can be greater to a man whose wife is the very impersonation of purity than to manufacture and circulate a report that she has played the harlot.

Christ is more than man. He is God. His mercy endureth forever toward them who repent. “All manner of sins and blasphemies shall be forgiven unto men,” conditioned upon their repentance. You who have traduced and slandered the Church of Christ may repent. If you have done this wilfully you are poor lost sinners. And “Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.”

As the Campbellites have spoken these hard sayings against the Church of Jesus Christ, and claim that their Church has taken the place of His Church, we conclude that this Campbellite Church is a fraud and a counterfeit. She cannot, therefore, be the Church of Christ.

That the Campbellites endeavor to excuse themselves for belonging to this new Campbell Church upon the plea that the Church established by Christ has proved untrue to him may be seen in almost every Campbellite book in the land.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE BAPTISTS.

The foregoing work, exposing the false claims of "The Campbellite Church," will prove a valuable help to those who are assailed by the insidious heresy of Campbellism. For the further discussion of this subject, the reader is referred to the *Text-Book on Campbellism*.

In this appendix the reader's attention is called to "What Baptists Believe."

BAPTIST DOCTRINE.

1st. *Baptists hold the Bible—the Inspired Word of God—as the only standard of authority, rule of faith and practice, and bond of union and communion for the churches of Christ.* That the New Testament, as confirmed by the Old, contains the only authoritative rule of faith and practice, is proved by the following Scriptures: Matt. 17:5; Acts 7:37; Heb. 10:28-31; 1 Sam. 15, 22, 23; Mark 7:7; Col. 2, 20-23; John 12:48, 49; Rev. 22:18, 19, and Matt.

28:19, 20. From the foregoing it will be observed that the disciples were to teach the converts all things commanded by Jesus Christ and nothing more.

While Baptists have written books, articles of faith, confessions of faith and statements of doctrine, none of these are regarded by them as their rule of faith and practice, or bond of union and communion, as a people. They earnestly contend for the Bible as their Book of Discipline, Confession of Faith and Christian System.

Dr. Wayland remarks: "The question is frequently asked, What is the creed, and what are the acknowledged standards of the Baptist churches in this country? To this the general answer has ever been, 'Our rule of faith and practice is the New Testament.' We have no other authority to which we all profess submission." Prin. and Prac. of Bapts., p. 13.

Also, Joseph Belcher, speaking of the Baptists, says: "It is important, however, that it should be well understood that nowhere do the churches of this denomination require subscription to this or any other human creed as a term of fellowship. They adhere rigidly to the New Testament as the

sole standard of Christianity.” Rel. Denom., U. S. G. B. p. 49.

In the first article of the abstract of principles contained in the Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge, it is affirmed, that the Bible is “The supreme standard by which all human conduct, creeds and opinions should be tried.” Religious Encyc., p. 191.

In fact, it is but the united voice of all Baptists throughout the world, that, “We profess to take for our guide, in all matters of religious belief and practice, the *New Testament*, the *whole New Testament*, and *nothing but the New Testament*.” Prin. and Prac. of Bapts., p. 85.

In answer to the charge made by Alexander Campbell that Baptists were governed by a Confession of Faith, John L. Waller replied:

“Let us, then, calmly examine creeds, as used by the Baptists, and see what there is in the matter so terrible to *Christians*. And we here state, and we defy all contradiction, that the only bond of union and communion ever recognized by the Baptist denomination, is the *Bible*. This every man acquainted with their history knows to be the truth. They never published any creed, long or short, at any time, as a bond of union and

communion. These, we say, are notorious facts, and we assert them in the face of the thousand and one statements to the contrary, made, of late years, in print and in the pulpit. That the Baptists have creeds, is admitted; but that these creeds are used as bonds of union, is denied." In explanation of the use of creeds among Baptists, Mr. Waller continues: "The first Confession of Faith ever published by the Baptists in England, was in 1643. They prefaced it thus: '*A Confession of Faith of seven congregations or churches of Christ, in London, which are commonly, but unjustly, called Anabaptists; published for the vindication of the truth and information of the ignorant; likewise for the taking off those aspersions which are frequently, both in pulpit and print, unjustly cast upon them.*' You will remark that it was published for the vindication of the truth, and to remove unjust imputations, under which the Baptists were suffering, and not as terms of union and communion." *Baptist Succession*, pp. 187, 188.

2nd. *Baptists firmly believe and teach the doctrine of salvation by grace, through faith in Jesus Christ.* Every individual of the human race, who reaches the Paradise of God must come

to glory through Jesus Christ and Him crucified; for "There is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." This is the Sun and center of the Christian System. Therefore, it cannot be emphasized too strongly or proclaimed too constantly. All other Bible doctrines borrow their glory and receive their value from this doctrine. Let it be emblazoned everywhere to earth's remotest bounds. Let it occupy a prominent place in every gospel sermon, in every Sunday School lecture and in every personal appeal. We should glory in the cross. Paul said: "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world." Christ crucified, buried and raised again are the three central facts in gospel teaching. They are first in importance and should be first in gospel preaching. Paul says: "I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures."

3rd. *Repentance.* The first requirement insisted upon, after having preached a crucified,

buried and risen Savior, is repentance. This is the first duty enjoined upon sinners, when they have heard the gospel. John the Baptist, Jesus Christ and all the apostles set forth repentance as the first duty of lost sinners. See Matt. 3:2, 4; Mark 6:12; Acts 2:38.

Repentance is "a change of mind and purpose, a change of one's mode of thinking, feeling, and acting," and results in a reformation of life. It is not merely an intellectual change. Any change of the intellect without the turning of the heart, is not acceptable in the sight of God. We must turn to the Lord with our hearts.

Repentance results from Godly sorrow for sin. 2 Cor. 7:10. It manifests itself in the confession of our sins, and in prayer to God for forgiveness. See Matt. 12:41; Jonah, 3d chapter; Acts 2:21; Luke 18:13.

4th. *Faith.* Faith in Christ is the second requirement. Mark 1:15. It is spoken of in the New Testament as believing on Christ and believing in Him. This is not merely an intellectual belief. God not only looks on the heart, but He calls for the heart. He says: "Give Me thine heart," and "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness."

The penitent sinner who believes in Jesus is no longer under condemnation. Jno. 3:18. He has everlasting life. Jno. 3:36. He is passed from death unto life. Jno. 5:24. He is born of God. 1 Jno. 5:1. It is called the door of faith, Acts 14:27, because we enter into justification and into grace by and through faith. In Romans 5:1, 2, we read: "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ: By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God."

Those passages that speak of believing in Christ and on Christ, if rendered literally, according to the original, would read believe *into* Christ.

5th. *Baptism*. It is the duty of the penitent believer to be baptized. According to the Greek-English Lexicons, and the most renowned scholars of all denominations, the original of the word baptize means immerse. The places where baptism was administered indicate immersion. See Matt. 3:16; Jno. 3:23; Acts 8:38, 39; Mark 1:5. This is made more certain by the fact that they were buried in baptism. See Rom. 6:4, and Col. 2:12.

Baptism is a likeness of Christ's death. Christ died, was buried and rose again. These great, central gospel facts are set forth in baptism. Nothing but immersion can set them forth.

Baptism is not only a likeness of Christ's death, but it is also a figure of salvation by the resurrection of Christ. 1 Pet. 3:21. Christ's resurrection not only manifests His power to save, but it also gives value to His death. See 1 Cor. 15:16-18. Hence, we are said to be saved by the resurrection of Christ. Baptism is a figure of salvation by His resurrection.

But there is an essential difference between a figure of a thing and the thing itself. A figure of salvation is not the salvation itself, though it represents it.

Baptism also declares that the person baptized is dead to sin, and that he rises from the liquid grave to walk in a new life.

6th. *The Lord's Supper.* The Lord's Supper is the eating and drinking of bread and wine, by the members of Christ's Church, in Church capacity, in remembrance of His death. Of course, the members of unscriptural and unbaptized churches, and churches having human

heads and founders, are not admissible to the sacred feast.

7th. *The Holy Spirit.* The Holy Spirit, in person, convinces the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment. See Jno. 16:7-10. Without the work of the Holy Spirit no man can come to Christ. Jno. 6:44. He quickens, or makes us alive from death in sins. Eph. 2:1, 5-7. He creates us anew in Christ. Eph. 2:10. He opens the heart to attend to the truths that are spoken by the gospel minister. Acts 16:14. He gives the increase which attends the labors of Christian ministers. 1 Cor. 3:5-7.

8th. *Security of the Believer.* The security of the believer is clearly taught in the Scriptures. "The gift of God is eternal life." Rom. 6:23. He that believes in Christ shall not perish, but shall have eternal or everlasting life. Jno. 3:15, 16, 36. He shall not come into condemnation. Jno. 5:24. Christ calls His disciples His sheep, and says: "They shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand." Jno. 10:28. It reads "neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand," in King James' version. But the word for "man" is not in the original. It should read: "Neither shall any

pluck them out of my hand ” The believer is kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation. 1 Pet. 1:5. Paul was persuaded that no thing, or creature was able to separate us from the love of God. Rom. 8:38, 39.

9th. *Salvation by Grace.* The Christian is saved by grace, to the exclusion of works as a condition of salvation. In Romans 11:5, 6, we read as follows:

“Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace. And if by grace, then *is it* no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if *it be* of works, then it is no more grace: otherwise work is no more work.”

Works and grace will not mix in God’s plan of saving sinners. If a man seeks in part to be saved by works, Christ will not go in partnership with him. He will have to fall back upon the law, and that will damn him unless he is as pure and holy, from his birth to his death, as an angel of light.

In Ephesians 2:8, 9, we have the following language: “By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: *it is* the gift

of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast.”

These two passages positively exclude all idea of salvation by works, and leave us to be saved by grace, through faith, or not be saved at all.

10th. *Good Works.* It is abundantly taught in the Scriptures that Christians should be careful to maintain good works. Titus 3:8. That they should be helpful to the poor. 1 Jno. 3:17. And that they should go and teach the gospel to all nations. Matt. 28:19, 20.

11th. *Endless Punishment.* The doctrine of endless punishment of unbelievers in hell is also clearly taught in the Bible. See Mark 9:43-48; Matt. 25:41, 46. The truth is brought out in connection with the rich man in hell, that there is no escape from torment. See Luke 16th chapter. Love for humanity should induce every Christian to do his utmost, while he has opportunity, to persuade every one to repent and believe the gospel, that he may not perish, but have everlasting life.

Conclusion. Now, in conclusion, we will say that it is the firm conviction of the author, that every believer in Christ ought to be a Baptist. That he owes this much to Christ, as a matter of

loyalty to Him, we submit the following reasons:

1st. The Baptist doctrine is Scriptural. The distinguishing features of Baptist doctrine are mentioned in this chapter. By turning to the proof-texts cited, and running the references, you will see that they are eminently Scriptural. And a Christian should always formulate his doctrine by the plain teaching of the Bible.

2nd. *Christ and the apostles were Baptists.* John, the harbinger of Christ, was named *the Baptist* by the Holy Spirit, because he was appointed of God to be the first administrator of this sacred ordinance. Jesus Christ and the apostles became the administrators of baptism, (though Christ Himself only baptized through His disciples); therefore, it is proper and in harmony with the Scriptures to call them Baptists. The churches formed of those baptized by John, Christ and His apostles as executives in the kingdom of Christ, are required to baptize converts through their offices; therefore, these churches, to all intents and purposes, were Baptist churches. Especially since human societies and names have multiplied during the ages, it is eminently proper

to designate the Scriptural churches as Baptist churches.

3rd. Baptists preach as did Christ and the apostles, making repentance the first duty of those who hear the gospel, [Matt. 3:2.] and enjoining faith in Christ upon all the penitent. Acts 19:4; Mark 1:15; Acts 20:21.

Our Baptist ancestors were called by their enemies Anabaptists, because they baptized anew those who had received the so-called infant baptism. This charge of Anabaptism they denied, contending that the former ordinance received in infancy was not baptism at all. They were willing to be known as Baptists.

The Savior went from Nazareth of Gallilee to Jordan, to be baptized by John the Baptist. We should not be ashamed to follow His example. Jesus says: "If any *man* will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me." To follow Christ is to do as He did. Christ came to a Baptist to be baptized. But if you go to some one else to be baptized, you are not following Him in this respect. "The disciple is not above *his* master, nor the servant above his lord. It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord."

The great commission as given by Jesus Christ, just before He ascended, says: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. And lo, I am with you alway even unto the end of the world."

Every saved person has been saved by our Lord Jesus Christ, and is under obligations, therefore, to be baptized in obedience to His command, and according to His example; and, to belong to the Church He has established. It is reasonable to suppose that it would please our Savior better for us to hold membership in the Church which He established, rather than to belong to one which we know has been built by some man. Then you would glorify your Savior better by holding membership in His Church, than you can by belonging to some man's Church, and your reward will be greater.

We here record the testimony of two of the most learned historians in the kingdom of Holland, Ypeij and Dermont, appointed to write the history of the *Dutch Reformed Church*, two learned Pedobaptists. They affirm that the

“Baptists, who were formerly called Anabaptists, and in later times Mennonites, were the original Waldenses; and have long in the history of the Church received the honor of that origin. On this account the Baptists may be considered as the only Christian community which has stood since the days of the apostles, and as a Christian society, which has preserved pure the doctrines of the gospel through all ages.”—Baptist Succession, p. 103.

Thus it appears that the “BAPTISTS MAY be considered as the only Christian community which has stood since the days of the apostles, and AS A CHRISTIAN SOCIETY THAT HAS PRESERVED PURE THE DOCTRINES OF THE GOSPEL THROUGH ALL AGES.”

That the reader may be led by the Spirit of God into all truth, is the prayer of the author.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Preface	1
Introduction	5
CHAPTER I.--CAMPBELLITE	9
Name Campbellite, Webster	11
Haley endorses the name Campbellite	13
CHAPTER II. THE NAME.	16
Argument from the name	17
Name of the Church not the Name of Christ	18
Name Christian	20
Name Christian in the Scriptures	25
CHAPTER III. THE NAME CONTINUED	29
Importance attached to the Name by Campbellite authors	29
Bible name for God's people	33
Testimony of Dr. Watson	35
Smith's Dictionary	37
CHAPTER IV. CAMPBELLITE CONFUSION OVER THE NAME	45
McNutt in a Campbellite Convention	47
Campbell opposed to the name Chris- tian Church	50
Campbell Against Being Called Chris- tians	52
Martin on the Name	53

	PAGE.
CHAPTER V. CAMPBELLITE CHURCH TOO YOUNG	57
Baptism for Salvation	58
Presbyterian Authors	59
Campbell not the Author of the Pet Phrases of the Reformation	62
The origin of Campbellism	63
Testimony of Moore and Burnett	64
CHAPTER VI. BAPTISMAL SALVATION	70
Testimony of Campbell	72
The Efficacy of Blood Ascribed to the Water	73
Testimony of Burgess	75
Testimony of Hopson	76
Testimony of Lard	77
Campbellism holds the Romish Doctrine	83
CHAPTER VII. BAPTISMAL SALVATION RE- FUTED	88
Williams on Acts 2:38	89
The Leper Cleansed	91
Points Stated by Bro. Suinney	95
CHAPTER VIII. BAPTISMAL SALVATION RE- FUTED, CONTINUED	98
Arguments from the Lord's Supper	99
Testimony of A. P. Williams	101
Washing Away of Sins	103
Born of Water, John 3:5	107
CHAPTER IX. BAPTISMAL SALVATION RE- FUTED, CONCLUDED	112

	PAGE.
Saved by Water in the Ark	112
The answer of a good conscience	119
Buried in Baptism	120
Baptized unto Christ's death	123
CHAPTER X. CAMPBELLISM ON THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT	128
Lard on Depravity	129
Campbell's Testimony	131
Power of the Holy Spirit Exhausted	133
Lard's Testimony	137
CHAPTER XI. THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT	141
Scripture Proofs	142
CHAPTER XII. CAMPBELLISM INVERTS THE COMAMNDMENTS	153
Testimony of Paul	155
Testimony of Christ	156
CHAPTER XIII. THE DAY OF PENTECOST	158
Gospel Preached before Pentecost	159
CHAPTER XIV. FALSE THEORY OF CAMP- BELLITES ABOUT PENTECOST	163
The Kingdom set up Before Pentecost	165
Christ a King Before Pentecost	166
CHAPTER XV. CAMPBELL THE HEAD AND FOUNDER OF THE CAMPBELLITE CHURCH	168
Statement of Henry Clay	168
Campbell the Recognized Head	169
CHAPTER XVI. APOLOGY FOR CAMPBELL AS THE FOUNDER	173

CONTENTS.


195

	PAGE.
The Kingdom set up by Jesus Christ	174
CHAPTER XVII. THE BAPTISTS	177
Points of Baptist doctrine	177
Baptist Succession	191
CONTENTS.	192



National Baptist Publishing Co.

This Company was duly and legally incorporated in 1878, as the St. Louis Baptist Publishing Co. As soon as organized it purchased the plates and copyrights of the Text Book on Campbellism, Baptist Succession, and Church Discussion. The Company now has more than one hundred and fifty different publications, from the pens of some of the ablest authors in America, and is prepared to furnish any thing in the book line. The name has been changed to National Baptist Publishing Company.



Send to us for
Theological Works,
Sunday-school Libraries,
Family and Pulpit
Bibles, Teachers' Bibles,
Testaments, Sunday-school Reward

Cards, Sunday-school Papers and Quarterlies.

Whatever may be wanted, let us hear from you. We will be pleased to correspond with you. Catalogues and price lists sent on application.

NATIONAL BAPTIST PUBLISHING CO.

1111 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.


The AMERICAN BAPTIST.

A large, eight-page, weekly, religious newspaper, devoted to the interests of the Baptist denomination, having the largest circulation of any Baptist paper west of the Mississippi River. A bold, uncompromising advocate of the truth. Price reduced to \$1.50 per year, in advance. Sample copy free. Subscribe now.

D. B. RAY, Editor, St. Louis, Mo.

The Sunday School Baptist.

A Baptist Sunday School paper. That there is a pressing necessity for a Sunday-school paper setting forth Baptist principles more positively and prominently will hardly be denied. As Baptists claim to hold the truth concerning the Church and its ordinances it is inexcusable to fail to teach the same to their children.


 Superintendents and pastors are especially invited to send for samples, which will be sent free. For terms address,

NATIONAL BAPTIST PUBLISHING CO.


1111 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

M-J









BK
7321

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 029 819 192 1